

in the bloody struggle to institute American liberty, human rights and freedom, under God, in this country.

It is a curious irony that the homeland of the great Pulaski is still crushed and held in the iron grip of tyranny and oppression against which he struggled in his early years.

After all these years, gallant Poland and its noble people have been in the vanguard of almost every struggle for freedom, yet they are still unliberated and held in bondage by Russian imperialist oppressors.

Even now, during our bitter struggles in Vietnam, Russian imperialism is giving comfort and aid to the aggressive designs and activities of Communist governments that are opposing the liberation of oppressed peoples in Asia.

The Communists profess peace but give it only lip service. If they would stop sending Mig aircraft, large guns of all kinds, and even missile systems of various kinds and military materiel, supplies, and equipment of almost every kind in support of the North Vietnamese, the present conflict could not be carried on for 2 weeks and would collapse of its own weight.

Let there be no misunderstanding on the part of the American people or anyone else that it is only because of the support of Russia that this bloody war is being continued and I hope and pray that the Russian Government will accede to the pleas of this Nation and all hu-

manity for peace, based on collective security in the world.

The great Pulaski will always be gratefully remembered by the American people of every generation. His spirit still lives and always will live because it is the spirit of freedom and dignity of man, the spirit breathed into the soul of every human being when he or she comes into this world, implanted in the breast not only of Americans but of all peoples, the spirit that does not recognize the oppression and exploitation of others, the spirit that seeks freedom and justice for all.

This was the spirit of Casimir Pulaski who gave his life for American independence and freedom for all.

As we again turn our thoughts with gratitude and deep appreciation to recollections of this great Polish hero's supreme sacrifice for this Nation and for freedom, let us resolve that his sacrifice and that of so many millions of boys throughout the world who died to defend and to enthrone freedom for all, shall not be in vain.

As we honor the great Pulaski, let us renew our determination to hold firm to the ideals and truths for which he gave his life, to preserve our own freedoms and to help other nations to preserve theirs and to stand resolutely with those who seek liberation for them and peace in the world in the name of Pulaski and let us all be re-inspired by Pulaski's supreme sacrifice for our country to continue to hold out the hand of encourage-

ment and assistance to his homeland of Poland that the time may come and not be too far distant, when this great nation may be freed from servitude and bondage and take its place once again in the ranks of the free independent nations of the earth.

## Columbus Day

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, 475 years have passed since the prosperous "land of opportunity" we now inhabit was discovered.

The courage and gallantry of the young man who made this discovery have been recorded in history books for centuries, but we, as a Nation, have yet to pay tribute befitting the magnitude of Christopher Columbus' accomplishment.

As Americans, we can boast of wealth, strength, and freedom, and for the pride with which we cherish America, Columbus is one to whom we owe a national debt of gratitude. This, in my opinion, can best be expressed by declaring October 12 a national holiday.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Rev. Tally Hanna, pastor, Oak Hill Methodist Church, Oak Hill, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God in Whom we live, and on Whom our hopes are built, we turn to Thee before acting upon the business of this day asking not for an easy time or an easy way out. We know that the good things of life are only won by hard work and cooperation.

Help us, Father, to love one another and when our minds clash against each other in opposition, grant us the wisdom of disagreeing without getting mad. Help us to realize that he that is slow to anger is better than the mighty and he that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city. Keep us calm and our minds open to Thy ways. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator

CXIII—1860—Part 22

from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,

President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 19, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BENNETT ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] be recognized for up to 45 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

### NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomina-

tions are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### DEATH OF FORMER PRIME MINISTER SHIGERU YOSHIDA, OF JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with great regret and sorrow that I learned of the passing of former Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida, of Japan.

Mr. Yoshida—a man of honesty and integrity—was responsible for much of the initiative in leading postwar Japan toward democracy and friendship with the United States, a friendship which has lasted and has been enhanced down to the present day.

Mr. Yoshida headed Japan's Government for 7 years between 1946 and 1954, and they were difficult years because they marked the period of the occupation. He signed the San Francisco Peace Treaty on April 28, 1952, which restored Japan to the status of an independent nation.

In many ways, Mr. Yoshida has been responsible for a renewed and continuing understanding between Japan and the United States, and he has been called most aptly the architect of the Japanese-American friendship which is in existence at this time.

May I express the sense of sorrow which the Senate feels on the passing of this great Japanese who did so much to restore Japan, to lead her back into the family of nations, and to cement the relations between our two great countries. His contributions were many, and they will form an enduring monument to the accomplishments which have marked his life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I remember with great interest a long visit I had with Prime Minister Yoshida in Tokyo some years ago. He was certainly an interesting personality, and a very strong personality, coming at a time when Japan, in her troubles and problems, needed a firm hand. I think he came on the scene at an opportune moment and exercised a tremendous influence on Japan, and its relations with other countries, and brought it out of difficulties.

So I share with and identify myself with the observations of the distinguished majority leader in expressing our sympathy and, generally speaking, our concern about the passing of a great man in another country with which we now have a very pleasant and cooperative relationship.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 20, 1967, he signed the enrolled bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 676) to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1933. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; and

S. 2310. An act to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 2561. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction for expenses incurred in the construction of residential fallout shelters of approved type and design; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. 2563. A bill to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### THE FERROALLOYS AND RELATED PRODUCTS IMPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1967

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, for the last few days the Committee on Finance has been considering several bills which would limit the importation into this country of various goods. It is my understanding that these proposals will be considered individually and in the aggregate, both as to the needs of domestic industries as well as potential impact on the international economic and diplomatic picture.

Among the commodities important to the economy of my State are ferroalloys and related products. There is evidence that rising imports of these products do constitute an unreasonable threat to the

health and future of these industries in the United States.

So that ferroalloys and related products may be included in the deliberations of the Committee on Finance, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2563) to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States, introduced by Mr. BAKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

#### TO DELAY HIGH UINTA WILDERNESS AREA

Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48); which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 48

Whereas the full development for beneficial use of Utah's limited water resources is fundamental to the future development and prosperity of the State; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation is presently engaged in water resource investigations in the Uinta Mountains in Utah in connection with the Ute Indian project of the ultimate phase of the central Utah project, with a reconnaissance report due in 1969; and

Whereas these investigations will determine the most feasible sites for the location of the necessary dams and other works of the project; and

Whereas drilling is also underway in the same area for oil and gas; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture is required under the provision of Public Law 88-577, the National Wilderness Preservation Act, to submit to Congress in September 1967, designated boundaries for twelve wilderness areas, and has chosen the High Uinta Wilderness Area as one of them; and

Whereas the designation of this area as a wilderness area will preclude the location of any reclamation works within it; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that congressional action be delayed on the designation of the High Uinta Wilderness Area in Utah until the reconnaissance report on the Ute Indian project of the ultimate phase of the central Utah project is completed in 1969, and until results of current testing for oil and gas in the area are known, but not later than December 31, 1969.

#### AMENDMENT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 415

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PROXMIER) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)



# CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

AMENDMENT NO. 416

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to H.J. Res. 888, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added at its next printing to S. 2551, a bill to impose annual quotas on the imports of potassium chloride into the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] be added as a cosponsor of my amendment No. 265. This is an amendment to H.R. 12080, the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1967, to provide coverage of certain drugs under medicare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS NOS. 400 AND 401—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on last Monday I submitted certain amendments intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080, the social security amendments bill now pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

The first amendment would require States to provide for the recruitment, training, and effective use of community service aids and social service volunteers in administering welfare programs.

The second amendment would direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study and make recommendations for accomplishing better service, advice, and assistance in according welfare recipients their full protection and use of laws and programs.

I am pleased to report, Mr. President, that these two amendments are gaining significant approval and support, both from within and without the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of these amendments, amendments Nos. 400 and 401, intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080, the names of Senators TYDINGS and CLARK be added as additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, these names added to those who have already become cosponsors of the amendments, Senators KENNEDY of New York, HART, MONDALE, BROOKE, HATFIELD, and NELSON, brings to nine the number of Senate cosponsors.

Further, I recently received a letter

from Mr. Rudolph T. Danstedt, ACSW, Washington director of the National Association of Social Workers, Inc., concerning these two amendments, as well as other matters, supporting the aims of both amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of that letter having to do with the two amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, INC.,  
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: I read with considerable interest the two amendments which you proposed to H.R. 12080—the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

Your amendment number 400 will, I am sure, strike a very responsive chord among a great many social workers to whom the problem of securing manpower for appropriate phases of our public welfare program is of very considerable concern. Over a year ago, a Task Force on Poverty of our Association, in response to a request we received from Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, indicated that we need to face up to some kind of staff system in the social services which recognizes three levels of personnel—the graduate social worker, the social work aide, who would have an undergraduate degree, and the subprofessional, who in your amendment is called a "community service aide".

We certainly support efforts to recruit and train welfare recipients for such community service aide positions, a practice now being followed by many OEO Community Action agencies.

I was impressed also by your amendment number 401 under which the HEW Secretary is asked to determine how staffs of public welfare agencies may move toward assuming some kind of an advocacy role with respect to the rights of assistance recipients for public assistance and other governmental programs.

Very importantly, your two amendments serve to give a badly needed positive emphasis to the welfare section of H.R. 12080, while your remarks are a most welcome offset to the repressive tone that seems to characterize the bill.

Sincerely yours,  
RUDOLPH T. DANSTEDT,  
ACSW, Director.

## ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 20, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

## NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

K. Edwin Applegate, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Indi-

ana for the term of 4 years, vice Richard P. Stein, resigned.

Asher E. Schroeder, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Iowa, for the term of 4 years, vice Donald E. O'Brien, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, October 27, 1967, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that the committee has scheduled hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, expressing the sense of the Congress that the Vietnam conflict should be submitted to the United Nations. These hearings will be held on Thursday, October 26, and Friday, October 27, in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building. They will begin at 10 a.m. on each day.

Persons wishing to testify on the resolution should communicate with Mr. Arthur M. Kuhl, the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## LABELING OF POTATOES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, four days ago, on October 17, 1967, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] took the floor to denounce S. 562, a bill now pending before the Senate Commerce Committee, the proposed National Potato Labeling Act.

Senator LAUSCHE contends that this bill will "serve one or two States to the disadvantage of the other States in the Nation." By this, he means Idaho and Maine, two famous potato-growing States.

The facts are, however, that support for this bill is not, in the least, confined to Idaho and Maine. Last year, the National Potato Council, the organization of commercial potato growers from throughout the country, voted 91 to 1 in favor of potato labeling by State of origin.

In giving its endorsement, the National Potato Council implicitly recognized that the American housewife associates potato quality with the area from which they come. This is not true of most other farm products. But potatoes are of differing varieties, sizes and taste; they possess differing qualities of mealiness, some better for one form of preparation than another. Each major area of potato production has become known, by the nature and quality of its yield, to millions of consumers in the grocery stores of the country.

Again let me stress, these well-known potato-growing areas are not restricted to Idaho or Maine. There are many others, the Red River Valley of North Dakota and Minnesota, the Klamath Basin of Oregon and California, the East-

ern Shore of Virginia and Maryland, the Connecticut River Valley of Massachusetts and Connecticut, to mention a few.

For this reason, the proposed National Potato Labeling Act has enjoyed widespread support from commercial potato growers in all parts of the country. They are striving to protect the identity of their product in the marketplace.

If potatoes were all alike, differing in no important way, regardless of where grown, or if their quality could be readily determined by outward appearance, or by the common tests of smell or feel, there would be no justification for S. 562. There would be neither need nor reason for labeling potatoes by State of origin. If such were the case, Senator LAUSCHE would be right in asking why this special labeling requirement should be applied to potatoes, but not to other agricultural products.

Potatoes, however, are not all alike. They have different qualities, depending on where grown, which are often undetectable by outward appearance or by application of any of the other common tests. This is why the Department of Agriculture, departing from customary practice, has given its support to the principle of special labeling requirements, by area of origin, where potatoes are concerned. And this is why, in judgment, the distinguished Senator from Ohio is in error when he charges, as he did on Tuesday, that the labeling requirements in this bill would impose a burden on the potato industry that "it ought not to have to bear."

The Senator also misconstrues the nature of the labeling called for by the bill. He alleges:

An Ohio potato would have to be labeled "Ohio Potato." A Wisconsin potato would have to be labeled "Wisconsin Potato." Minnesota, which grows a great number of potatoes, likewise would have to label them "Minnesota potatoes."

This is simply not so. In the first place, there is no requirement whatever in the bill for labeling individual potatoes; the labeling provision applies only to containers, to the package in which the potatoes are sold. Furthermore, nothing in the bill precludes or impairs the use of established brand names, nor is there any requirement whatever that the brand name selected must incorporate the name of the State in which the potatoes were grown. Packaged Ohio potatoes would not have to be sold as "Ohio potatoes," as the Senator implies.

Actually, the labeling requirement, in line with good truth-in-packaging practices, is purely factual in character. The bill provides that the container in which the potatoes are packed shall bear a label "which clearly indicates, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary, the State of origin of the potatoes, and the name and address of the packer or repacker." The purpose is to give factual information to the ultimate consumer, to which every interested housewife ought to be entitled.

Senator LAUSCHE, as we all know, is opposed to false advertising and deceptive marketing practices. He takes the position, in this case, that present laws are adequate to protect both the potato

grower and consumer. If this were so, Mr. President, S. 562 would never have been introduced. The very fact that the National Potato Council calls for the enactment of this bill, and support for it comes from every corner of the country, should be evidence enough that present laws have proved inadequate.

I, for one, can testify to the failure of present laws to put a stop to the recurrent sale of large quantities of potatoes as Idaho potatoes, which are grown in other States. My efforts, over the past 5 years, to end this misrepresentation in the marketplace have proved unavailing. Senator LAUSCHE says existing laws are "very distinct and precise." Well, perhaps they are to the Senator from Ohio, who would not condone the deception I have just described. But the Federal Trade Commission, despite many prodings, refuses to take action, apparently unable to decide whether or not it is charged with responsibility. As for the Food and Drug Administration, it has furnished no relief, no investigation, and no prosecution under any existing law.

Does the Senator from Ohio really think these avenues have not been fully explored? We come here to plead for a remedy to right a wrong. The proposed National Potato Labeling Act is necessary if deceptive and fraudulent practices in the marketing of potatoes are to be abated. Bringing to an end the misrepresentation of potatoes through a State-of-origin labeling requirement will not, as the Senator has charged, impose a burden on industry which it ought not to bear; rather, the requirement will lift from the consumer a burden he ought not to bear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point four statements which were presented in testimony before the Committee on Commerce when hearings were held on the bill, which develop in full the case for S. 562.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF DOYLE BURNS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL POTATO COUNCIL

My name is Doyle Burns. I am Executive Director of the National Potato Council. This is a non-profit, voluntary organization whose membership is made up of all commercial potato growers from throughout the United States. I am authorized to testify here on behalf of the National Potato Council.

During the most recent Eighteenth Annual Meeting of this organization, held November 14-15, 1966, in Phoenix, Arizona, several resolutions were adopted, of which Resolution No. 3 reads as follows: Resolved, that the National Potato Council request and support legislation requiring that all potatoes packed or shipped, with the exception of potatoes for processing, be labeled as to the State of Origin.

Potatoes are a rather unusual crop in many respects. There are no government controls or restrictions on the acreage which can be planted or the amount which may be marketed. As a result, potato plantings are influenced by the allotments allowed on certain other crops. This oftentimes works to the disadvantage of potatoes by creating a huge surplus of supplies for which there is no market. It has also been established that the demand for potatoes is fairly static.

We do not eat more potatoes just because we have more available or when they are selling at a lower price.

Generally speaking, when there is an excess of potatoes available to the market, the market becomes more selective and only the better qualities of potatoes will be shipped with the poorer qualities finding their way into salvage outlets such as livestock feed or starch. During periods of scarcity the market will accept some potatoes of a poorer quality in order to meet its needs. Thus the quality of any given lot of potatoes becomes an important factor in its marketability.

Many production areas have become quite conscious of the importance of marketing only quality potatoes regardless of the available supply and have restricted themselves to selling or offering for sale only the better qualities. As a result of this practice (and it is to be highly commended in the public interest), some areas have developed an enviable reputation. This reputation is on rather shaky ground so long as unscrupulous operators in other areas of production can prepare potatoes for shipment and represent them as being the product of a quality marketing area. This is being done and has been a common practice on the part of some dealers in some areas for years.

There is a second group of offenders, however, who contribute to this practice and probably make up a greater volume of business than those mentioned above. These are the people who buy potatoes from many areas of the country, bring them together at a central location and proceed to regrade the entire lot and place them in consumer packs without bothering to identify the origin of any of the lots; or, declaring on the consumer container that the potatoes therein are from some particular state when in actuality only part of the pack, or in some cases, none of the potatoes come from the state or area declared on the container.

Finally, there is the retailer who does not bother to remove identification on or about the potato bin which states that the potatoes on display are from a certain specific area. This law would not prohibit him from leaving such signs on his potato bin but, if the state of origin is on the container, the customer will soon learn to read the label and disregard such misleading signs.

These are the three principal types of offenders. The next question is: "Who is hurt by this practice?"

This Bill has been offered in the interest of the general public. If the consumer wants to buy potatoes from some particular state, regardless of her reasons, she is entitled to some assurance that those potatoes are accurately labeled. It is misleading and false advertising to continue such practices.

Secondly, the potato industry must strive vigorously to make sure that high quality, usable potatoes will be found in the retail stores in order to defend ourselves against the inroads of competing food products. One of the few ways that such quality can be assured is to encourage areas of production to develop their identity by putting out only the very best pack possible. It is important that each area develop a pride in its own product. This Bill, S. 562, will afford the area a reasonable protection and some guarantee that its efforts to deliver to the consumer a full measure of value have not been thwarted by someone whose only goal is a fast, easy dollar.

I respectfully urge that this Bill be favorably received and reported out at the earliest possible date.

STATEMENT OF A. E. MERCKER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ON BEHALF OF THE VEGETABLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA (VGAA)

Mr. Chairman, my name is Albert E. Mercker. I am Executive Secretary of the Vegetable Growers Association of America



which was established in 1908. The address is 815 17th Street, N.W., Room 226, Washington, D.C. 20006. The organization in general is comprised largely of small and medium sized family-operated vegetable and potato farms, including the small market gardeners that surround the large Eastern municipalities and the larger commercial family-operated farms of the Southeast and Midwest.

Our Association favors this bill and urges its adoption.

There is a certain amount of misrepresentation of potatoes and vegetables in the market place, sometimes brought about by deliberate mislabeling, or the failure of the repacker, or retailer, to place any label on the potatoes or labeling them under areas of production that have a good to excellent reputation. An increasing proportion of fresh potatoes, in my judgment about 75 percent, are sold at retail in consumer size packages and often lose their identity as to their State of origin.

We firmly believe that potatoes should be marked so that at the time of purchase the purchaser of fresh potatoes, be he a consumer or purchaser for a restaurant, or other public eating places, may, by knowing where the goods were produced, be able to buy or refuse to buy them, if such markings should influence his will.

Any grower, shipper, or repacker, who has confidence in the grade, quality, and pack of his potatoes has nothing to fear from this legislation. This bill would help to place the potato industry on a merchandising basis. Individual brands, or area brands of quality potatoes, would obtain premiums over other packs and encourage the packing of a higher quality pack with a minimum of defects. In this way the per capita consumption of fresh potatoes would be increased.

Consumers have a record high take home pay and are constantly looking for better quality merchandise. When consumers see a labeled package of potatoes as to grade and State of origin, they are more likely to purchase the labeled potatoes or vegetables. This decision, multiplied many times over each day, would add significantly to the income of potato or vegetable producers.

This bill, if enacted into law, would enable every State to protect its fair name within and without its borders. It would also be beneficial to the entire potato industry.

I thank the Committee for the opportunity and privilege of appearing before you on behalf of the Vegetable Growers Association of America.

STATEMENT OF EDD MOORE, EXECUTIVE MANAGER, IDAHO GROWER SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION, INC., IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Edd Moore. I am the Executive Manager of the Idaho Grower Shippers Association, Inc. This is a non-profit voluntary association, with headquarters at 357 "C" Street, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401, whose members are engaged in growing, packing, and shipping of Idaho potatoes. In the aggregate, they handle approximately 90 percent of the State's tonnage of fresh potatoes.

The importance of potatoes as a staple food has increased through the ages until today the annual world production exceeds 8 billion bushels—which now exceeds the production of wheat. Their annual value is greater than all the gold and silver produced. On a national basis, potatoes rate sixth in cash receipts exceeded only in value by cotton, wheat, soybeans, corn and tobacco—which incidentally are government supported.

Potatoes are the number one basic food in America and account for nearly 25 percent of all fresh fruits and vegetables purchased at retail. The per capita consumption is now reported to be 120 pounds.

Potatoes are produced in all 50 states and somewhere among these states potatoes are being planted and harvested every month in the year. In 1965 they were the most important cash crop in Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Idaho and Alaska. Production amounts to about 1½ million acres annually and is valued at retail in excess of 1½ billion dollars.

Presently, Idaho leads the United States in potato acreage, production and processing. Economically, potatoes are the "Main Spring of Idaho—the largest industry dollar-wise." We have been producing and shipping potatoes for approximately 60 years and during that period of time have shipped over 1,815,000 carloads of potatoes from Idaho.

One of the most popular varieties produced in this country is the Russet Burbank. Idaho produces approximately one-half of this variety, the balance being grown in Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Texas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, New York and Maine. In the past several years Idaho's production of potatoes equals about 30 percent of the U.S. late production.

In recent years increased agricultural technology has resulted in many thousands of dollars being spent annually by the Federal Government, as well as the various states, for research at the production level, to improve the quality of potatoes for growers and consumers alike. Quality in potatoes is often based on the adaptability of a given variety to weather and soil conditions in a given locality. This, of course, leads to the phenomena of increased locality identification.

We wholeheartedly support S. 562. Enactment of this "National Potato Labeling Act" will afford the necessary protection to potato growers in their respective states who assess themselves for the purpose of promoting their potatoes. Most of the major potato producing states today are engaged in various types of promotional programs. To substantiate this fact we offer you copies of advertisements taken at random during the past year from "The Packer", a fresh fruit and vegetable publication. From these ads you will note that each state is promoting its own potatoes.

According to USDA, acreage harvested this past year from these 14 states, was in excess of 1,000,000 acres, or slightly over two-thirds of the total U.S. production. Potato growers are not subsidized by the Federal Government. Promotion is strictly a self-help program.

Congress has passed legislation directed to truth in labeling. Enacted over 25 years ago was the Federal Seed Act, which includes seed potatoes shipped across state lines. This act specifically provides for, among other things, identification of the state of origin of the seed potatoes and the name and address of the shipper on all seed offered for sale. It is submitted that one of the principal reasons this legislation was enacted was to give to the growers who were buying seed protection as to the identity of the growing region, of the type of seed he desired to purchase and the type of seed that would best serve his needs.

The Perishable Agriculture Commodities Act was passed in 1930, which was sponsored by the late Senator Borah of Idaho. This Act specifically applies to trading rules and regulations governing the fresh fruit and vegetable industry, which were sorely needed to correct unethical trading practices. Under the existing provisions of the PAC Act, misbranding only occurs when the contents of a container do not correspond with the markings on the container. There are no specific provisions requiring identification of grade, variety, state of origin, shipper, packer or repacker. Here is a typical container extensively used throughout the country, which is completely void of the aforementioned

identifications, yet in complete compliance with the PAC Act.

Again, please bear in mind that misrepresentation only occurs when the contents of a container do not correspond with the markings on the container. The positive need for enactment of the "National Potato Labeling Act" is to correct the many abuses of this unidentified container by word, act or deeds. For example: Visualize, if you please, a display of Russet Burbank potatoes in this unidentified container in a supermarket. Over or nearby this display is placed Point of Purchase material (such as we use in Idaho, and is available from some 15 other major Russet producing states) which is suggestive, appealing and positive in its identification. The adverse and improper result of this unethical practice is sale by association or inference. The innocent housewife is duped into thinking that the potatoes she buys in the unidentified package are potatoes coming from the state shown on the Point of Purchase material. This situation would be equally true for any variety from any area. Further, it would be equally true on a display of bulk potatoes. This devious sale technique is not a violation of the act.

In addition, the use of containers without representations of any sort lend themselves very readily to misrepresentation either by inference, or by word, act or deed, in the merchandising and sale of potatoes. In addition to this problem the failure to place any identification also makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to trace potatoes for the purpose of procuring enforcement of the PAC Act.

By contrast, here is a container that factually identifies the producer and state of origin. Certainly this type of container identifies the product so that a given consumer, having purchased the product, can then go back and repurchase the product knowing she will be getting the same product she previously purchased.

In addition, Congress passed the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, which is administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This act prohibits the shipment in interstate commerce of a food if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular. The main difference between the two acts is that the Food & Drug law deems a food to be misbranded, if in package form, unless it bears a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor. We have been informed on several occasions by officials of the Food & Drug Administration that the origin of the food product is not required to be shown on the container. Nor does the manufacturer, packer, or distributor need to be located at the point of origin of the product shipped. Therefore, a packer or distributor of potatoes could be located anywhere and ship his otherwise unidentified containers into any state and sell them into any market to his advantage and be within the Federal laws.

The very fact that potatoes can be legally sold without the identification of origin creates a very favorable atmosphere for those unscrupulous operators who practice the art of deception by inference, or otherwise. Sales by deceptive means or oral representation are practically impossible to enforce.

Following is an example as to the manner in which this type of deception works.

Let us say a packer or repacker, licensed under the PAC Act, is located in Chicago, Illinois, and is packaging potatoes for retail outlets. Further, that he is packing the Russet Burbank variety on a specified order for Washington Russets. Assume for the sake of discussion that the f.o.b. price of Russets in Wisconsin was about the same as in Washington. The freight differential between Washington and Wisconsin is approximately \$1.00 per hundredweight, or about \$500.00



per car. Through the use of the unidentified container as to point of origin, the retail buyer has absolutely no way of knowing where his potatoes originated. All the buyer can do is accept the oral word of the seller that he received Washington Russets. You can rest assured that the delivered price was based from Washington, and that the grower in Wisconsin was not compensated accordingly. Both the retailer and the consumer has paid an exorbitant price as a result of these trading practices. This same example could be used on red potatoes from Wisconsin and Red River Valley. An operator in New York City could purportedly be selling Maine potatoes but substituting locally grown potatoes. The same tactic could be performed in most of the major markets. This is vicious competition! With this excessive profit, this unethical operator can always undersell the legitimate operator. Results: either the legitimate operator is forced out of business or joins the club of quickbuck artists. Passage of S. 562 is urgently needed to correct these flagrant abuses.

The purpose of this bill is simple. It provides for the labeling of all fresh potatoes so that the ultimate consumers and buyers may know with certainty the state of origin of the potatoes purchased. Also, it will provide positive protection for the growers who are willing to invest their dollars to promote the sale of their potatoes.

It is our observation that labeling will improve product quality by identification of the packer, if for no other reason than pride of label. Packer identification will enhance the enforcement at the terminal or retail level when misbranding exists.

Enactment of the "National Potato Labeling Act" will materially assist the Food & Drug Administration in identifying the origin and packer when contaminated potatoes are shipped.

The fresh potato industry needs only true and accurate branding of state of origin, and the name and address of the packer, repacker or seller on every package or lot of fresh potatoes offered for sale.

The provisions of this Bill will equally protect the grower and consumer. Presently, the buying public is left entirely unprotected where specific identifications are lacking. To assure that the best practice of the marketplace become common practice against the selfish minority who defraud and deceive the public, charge unfair prices, or engage in other sharp practices, there exists an unquestionable need for passage of this vital legislation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, we very much appreciate the opportunity afforded us to present our views on this bill. We respectfully request favorable action on this "National Potato Labeling Act" to afford the consumers an honest product selection, as well as to protect the growers and merchandisers of potatoes.

TESTIMONY OF HAROLD E. BRYANT TO BE PRESENTED TO THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE, RELATIVE TO S. 562

My name is Harold E. Bryant. I am executive Vice President of the Maine Potato Council, and Consultant to the Maine Potato Commission, both offices being located in Presque Isle, Maine.

The Maine Potato Council is a trade association of growers, shippers and allied industries associated with the production and marketing of Maine potatoes. We have as members all potato growers in the State of Maine.

I also represent the Maine Potato Commission. Since 1936 potato growers in the State of Maine have had a self-imposed tax whereby they tax themselves two cents a barrel (a barrel weighs 165 pounds) for all potatoes produced in Maine being used for human consumption. These funds are used

for research, advertising and the promotion of Maine potatoes.

At the present time Maine is the second largest producer of potatoes in the United States, being second to the State of Idaho. Maine has been recognized over a period of many years as one of the leading producers of quality potatoes in the United States. Being located in the extreme northeastern part of the United States our natural sales and distribution territory for Maine potatoes is that area east of the Mississippi River.

Our potatoes are harvested in September and October and marketed throughout the winter months. In the marketing of our crop we compete with most of the other states who harvest their crop in the fall of the year and market during the winter months. This would include Idaho, N. Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan and all of the eastern states north of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Like some, but not all, of our competing states our growers are continually trying to upgrade the quality of our product and improve the image of Maine potatoes in the market place. In addition to trying to deliver quality merchandise we, like Idaho and some other states, spend large sums of money promoting our potatoes in the market place. We believe we have an excellent quality product and we want the housewife to be able to identify that product and ask for it if she believes it to be the most desirable for her purposes. Regardless of the fact that we are spending a great deal of money promoting and advertising our potatoes we find that in many cases our efforts are being nullified and the housewife finds it impossible to identify our product or the product of any other quality-minded potato producing states because in too many cases potatoes may be advertised in the retail stores as coming from one state when actually they were grown in some other state.

In addition to this a practice has been developed in the retail stores whereby a broad area of identification will be used such as having signs saying "Eastern Potatoes". This is a very common practice in the markets along the eastern seaboard. "Eastern" potatoes could mean potatoes coming from anywhere in the east; they may come from excellent potato producing areas or may be extremely poor quality. If they are and the housewife is dissatisfied, far too often she will cease to buy potatoes of any kind, so that those states who are trying and do a good job of production and marketing are penalized along with those areas who do not put out the effort necessary to deliver quality merchandise.

Idaho for illustration is a strong competitor of Maine. We are willing to compete with Idaho or any other quality-minded potato producing state, and let the housewife and the consuming public be a judge of the merits of our product compared to competitors. If we are unable to meet competition we must suffer the consequences.

However, we do believe that both consumers and growers are entitled to have the product they buy, and in the case of growers the product they sell, identified so that everyone knows what they are buying and may be able to reward or penalize the producers on the basis of the quality merchandise they are delivering.

Representing the potato industry in the State of Maine we urge this committee to support S. 562.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the presence in the Chamber this morning of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], who has joined with me in the cosponsorship of this measure, along with the senior Senator from Washing-

ton [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I concur fully with the remarks of my distinguished colleague [Mr. CHURCH].

The production of quality potatoes is big business in my State, just as it is in other States. In Idaho we are justly proud of the quality of our potatoes. Our bill, S. 562, gives the consumer protection by insuring that the label on the potatoes the housewife buys does not misrepresent the product.

Idaho potato farmers and shippers have come to Washington in unanimous support of the bill, as have persons from other parts of the Nation. All we ask is that the bill be reported out of committee so that all Senators may have the opportunity to make up their own minds as to its merits.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 652, S. 2068; Calendar No. 653, S. 2179; Calendar No. 654, S. 108; and Calendar No. 655, H.R. 11767.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AN ACT TO FIX STANDARDS FOR HAMPERS, ROUND STAVE BASKETS, AND SPLINT BASKETS FOR FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

The bill (S. 2068) to repeal certain acts relating to containers for fruits and vegetables; exportation of tobacco plants and seed; naval stores; and wool; and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2068

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Acts of Congress listed below are hereby repealed:

(a) The Act of August 31, 1916, entitled "An Act to fix standards for climax baskets for grapes and other fruits and vegetables, and to fix standards for baskets and other containers for small fruits, berries, and vegetables, and for other purposes" (39 Stat. 673, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 251-256);

(b) The Act of May 21, 1928, entitled "An Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 685, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 257-2571);

(c) The Act of June 5, 1940, entitled "An Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes" (54 Stat. 231; 7 U.S.C. 516-517);

(d) The Naval Stores Act approved March 3, 1923 (42 Stat. 1435; 7 U.S.C. 91-99);

(e) The Act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An Act to authorize the appropriation for use



by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain funds for wool standards, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 593; 7 U.S.C. 415b-415d).

Sec. 2. Section 10(b) (3) of the Act of November 3, 1966 (80 Stat. 1302; 15 U.S.C. 1459 (b) (3)), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) containers subject to the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1912 (37 Stat. 250, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 231-233), or the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1186, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 234-236)."

Sec. 3. This Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 668), explaining the purposes of this bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill, which was requested by the Department of Agriculture, would repeal the Standard Container Acts of 1916 and 1928, Tobacco Seed and Plant Exportation Act of 1940, Naval Stores Act of 1923, and Wool Standards Act of 1928.

The Standard Container Acts prescribe standard sizes and capacities for certain types of baskets and hampers used in shipping fresh fruits and vegetables. The Department advises that shipping methods have so changed since the acts were enacted, that now less than 10 percent of fresh fruits and vegetables are marketed in the regulated baskets and hampers. With repeal of these acts, the bill would bring the containers regulated by them under the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, approved last year. The Tobacco Seed and Plant Exportation Act prohibits exportation of tobacco seed in order to protect American growers, and is no longer useful since tobacco production is now well established outside the United States. The Naval Stores Act provides for the establishment of standards and grading and prohibits false or misleading practices, and the Wool Standards Act provides for the development of standards. The standards and grading work now done under the latter two acts can be done under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, and the Department advises that there is no need for special legislation covering these two commodities. With the repeal of such legislation the Department advises that it could reduce its standards and inspection work on wool to a level commensurate with the need therefor.

The Department estimates that enactment of the bill will result in an annual reduction of \$116,000 in Federal expenditures.

#### SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS FOR ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS HOSPITALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2179) to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment in line 6, after "31," strike out "1970," and insert "1970."; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1446a), is amended by striking in subsections (a) and (b) the words "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 669), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill would extend the Armed Forces and veterans' hospital milk programs for 3 years, until December 31, 1970. These programs authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make dairy products acquired under the price support program available to veterans' hospitals, the Armed Forces, Department of Defense hospitals, and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The committee amendment would correct the punctuation.

#### CONVEYANCE OF RIGHT, TITLE, AND INTEREST IN CERTAIN LANDS CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF MAINE

The bill (S. 108) to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

#### S. 108

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Maine, without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained by it in the tract of land which was conveyed to the State of Maine pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey the Kennebec Arsenal property, situated in Augusta, Maine, to the State of Maine for public purposes", approved March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1270), by a deed from the United States dated April 2, 1905.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 670), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the State of Maine, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States as reserved in a conveyance to the State of the Kennebec Arsenal property pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1270).

#### EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The property in question has been used continuously since 1905 as part of the Maine Insane Hospital. This authority is now sought to permit the State to use a portion of this property for a fire department and other public purposes, but is precluded from doing so by the conditions of the original conveyance. The bill, S. 108 would, if enacted, authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to release these conditions.

#### BACKGROUND

The Kennebec Arsenal was originally established by the War Department in 1836 comprising 40 acres of land located on the east side of the Kennebec River in Augusta, Maine. The arsenal was abolished by order of the Secretary of War, May 1, 1901. Subsequently, under an act of Congress approved March 3, 1905, the Secretary of War, by deed dated April 12, 1905, conveyed the entire property to the State of Maine for use in connection with the Maine Insane Hospital. Both the act and the deed contained provisions which (1) restricted the property to be used only in connection with the insane hospital; and (2) authorized the President of the United States, in his discretion, to repossess the property if needed for uses of the United States.

Since this property has not been under military control for many years, the records of the Department of the Army contain very little information with respect to the former installation. An investigation discloses that the property has been used continuously since 1905 as part of the Maine Insane Hospital. The State has indicated that it now desires to use a portion of this property for a fire department and other public purposes, but is precluded from such use by the conditions of the conveyance. This bill would, in effect, authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to release these conditions.

The Department of the Army no longer has any direct interest in this property, and there are no foreseeable future defense requirements for its use. Consequently, the release of the deed restrictions is not objectionable to the Department of the Army.

Since the General Services Administration is the primary disposal agency for the United States, their views were solicited since one of the conditions to the release is the right of the President to recapture possession of the property at any time for the needs of the United States. This agency has advised that it is their understanding that the State intends to continue to use the remainder of the 40 acres and other adjoining lands belonging to the State for the purpose of the mental hospital, and that the fire department will be used primarily for the protection of the hospital; that while GSA is generally opposed to legislative proposals of this type, under the circumstances of this case, they have no objection to the enactment of S. 108.

#### FISCAL DATA

The enactment of this bill will have no effect on the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

#### U.S. NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The bill (H.R. 11767) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 671), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this legislation is to permit the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede to the State of California all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for retrocession,



of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over any lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

#### EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This authority is sought particularly to permit the State of California, acting through local civil authorities, to furnish regular police protection to the 391 families residing in two Navy housing projects constructed on separate parcels (88.77 acres and 58.86 acres) of land which now comprise parts of the Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif. The retrocession would be accomplished by filing written notice thereof with the Governor of California, to be effective upon its acceptance by the State in such manner as its laws may prescribe.

#### BACKGROUND

This legislation was submitted as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 90th Congress. The purpose is to permit the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede to the State of California certain lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif. This authority is sought particularly to permit the State of California, acting through local civil authorities, to furnish regular police protection to the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

The U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., comprises a total of 1,503.63 acres of land and submerged lands. The main site of the naval station encompasses 1,102.46 acres acquired by separate condemnation actions in 1940, 1942, and 1963. The remaining 401.17 acres of land, acquired by condemnation and transfer, are the sites of seven separate off-station Navy housing projects.

Over most of the naval station and five of the off-station housing projects, the Government jurisdiction is proprietorial only. However, over a 243.46-acre portion of the main site (including 219.58 acres in which the Government interest is only a leasehold until August 9, 1970), the Government presently has partial legislative jurisdiction, subject only to State reserved powers of taxation and service of civil and criminal process. Such jurisdiction is vested by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution, section 255 of title 40, United States Code, an act of the California Legislature of March 12, 1872, as amended by chapter 710 of the statutes of 1939 (California Political Code, sec. 34), and Secretary of the Navy letter of April 5, 1943, accepting jurisdiction, acknowledged by California State Lands Commission letter of April 10, 1943.

The same Federal constitutional provision and statute, the same substantive California law, recodified as California Government Code, section 111, by chapter 134, California Statutes of 1943 Secretary of the Navy letter of November 12, 1943, accepting jurisdiction and California State Lands Commission acknowledgment letter of November 12, 1943, operated to vest the Government with similar jurisdiction over 485 acres acquired in 1942 for use in connection with the U.S. Naval Fuel Depot, San Pedro, Calif. Two portions of this 485-acre tract, measuring 58.86 and 88.77 acres, were subsequently transferred from the Naval Fuel Depot, San Pedro, to the Naval Station, Long Beach. Their development and use as Palos Verdes public quarters and the San Pedro fund housing project, respectively, has given rise to a significant problem in the furnishing of adequate police protection to the 391 families residing in the housing projects. The Government's existing legislative jurisdiction over the entire 485 acres leaves local police authorities with no jurisdiction over these projects for performance of their ordinary functions of law enforcement and protection of persons and property on behalf of the residents. The Navy shore patrol, the only Government police agency readily available, cannot effectively police these residential areas since it has no general authority over persons other than members of the Armed

Forces. Under section 13 of title 18, United States Code, the criminal laws of the State would be enforceable in the project areas notwithstanding the lack of State jurisdiction, but only as Federal law and only by such other Government police officers as may be provided. The forum for enforcement of such laws would be the U.S. district court.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT

The law enforcement agencies of the city of Los Angeles and of the county of Los Angeles, presently rendering police services in the general localities of Palos Verdes public quarters and the San Pedro fund housing project, have both indicated willingness to furnish these housing projects with their regular services if the impediment of lack of jurisdiction is removed. Government retrocession of legislative jurisdiction over these projects as soon as possible is considered highly desirable to relieve the existing unhappy situation. This will make regular police services of the city of Los Angeles and the county of Los Angeles available to occupants of portions of the housing project under their respective jurisdictions. Advising that State acceptance of retrocession of Government jurisdiction will require an act of the California Legislature, the California State Lands Commission has prepared proposed general legislation to effect State consent to Government retrocession of jurisdiction under certain conditions of procedure. Such proposed legislation will be submitted to the legislature in its 1967 session.

This proposal is consistent with similar special legislation previously enacted, and the draft legislation is flexible. Neither limited to nor describing specific installation areas or ends to be attained, it is designed to vest the Secretary of the Navy with authority to make such adjustment in legislative jurisdiction over the lands of the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., as he deems desirable. Exercise of this authority with regard to the two housing projects will permit local police authorities to furnish to their occupants the same protection of person and property which they presently furnish to the naval station's five other housing projects and to the community in general.

#### COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this legislative proposal would not result in an increase in budgetary requirements.

#### DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

This bill incorporates a legislative proposal submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense as part of its legislative program for the 90th Congress, as is evidenced by a letter addressed to President of the Senate, dated July 3, 1967, which is set out below and made a part of this report.

#### PEOPLE PEOPLE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the dialog that has continued these many months in the Senate concerning U.S. policy in Asia and Vietnam, it has become rather fashionable for the critics of present policy periodically to launch attacks on a certain aspect of policy or utterance by public officials; address their criticism to that point for as many days as it can command a headline; and then lay back until another issue comes along. It now seems that if no new issue becomes readily available, the critics then proceed to invent one.

For the past few days, for example, the Vietnam critics have addressed themselves to the contrived allegation that Secretary of State Rusk has resurrected—for political reasons—the old “yellow peril” fears, and they have attempted to persuade public opinion that

the Secretary, for sinister reasons, has unfairly preyed on a public fear about the yellow masses of Asia inundating the world.

This, of course, is sheer poppycock, and the tactics of the critics in attempting to characterize Secretary Rusk's remarks in such a context are obvious attempts to create another “straw man.”

The issue at stake in Asia, Mr. President, is not yellow people—nor green people, nor purple people, nor brown people. The issue is people people. There are millions of Chinese. But there are also millions of other Asians in the adjacent Asian countries, and it is the opportunity to win the chance for these Asian people to determine their own destinies that is really at stake in the world today. The billion non-Chinese in Asia surely have as deep a personal stake in the future shape and form of the Asian Continent as do the billion Chinese. The issue has no connection with the color of people's skins but everything to do with the people themselves.

Needless to say, an Asiatic continent brought into balance among the competing interests of all Asians serves best our own national interest as well. Since World War II, the foreign policy of the United States has wisely had as a part of its underpinnings the principle of preventing any one nation from dominating the continent of Europe and, by the same token, has pursued the goal of preventing any one power from dominating the Far East. By restraining the expansive and threatening flutterings of a China in convulsions now, we can best hope to win time for the other nations of Asia to restructure their own balance of forces and to maintain their own stability. The goal of peaceful change rather than bloody and violent change creates a far better climate for progress in Asia.

#### FORMER CONGRESSMAN HASKELL PROPOSES EDUCATION PLAN TO HELP CHILDREN OF POVERTY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, former Representative Harry G. Haskell, Jr., of Delaware, has proposed an imaginative plan of intensive education to help rescue children who are now likely to continue in their present pattern of poverty and despair.

In a speech last night in Wilmington to members of the committee of 39, a nonpartisan civic organization, Mr. Haskell suggested an intensive program of education aimed at children in the critical learning period from 4 to 8 years of age. He calls his idea catch-up education, and suggests that a Wilmington school where 50 percent or more of the children are in the poverty category be selected for a demonstration project.

This imaginative plan advanced by Mr. Haskell is in keeping with his long record of personal interest and action in the affairs of his city and State.

In the interests of bringing his plan to the attention of a wider audience, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech last night be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:



# THE PEOPLE OF OUR CITY DEMAND THE LONG-RANGE SOLUTION

(An address by Harry G. Haskell, Jr., to the Committee of 39 on Thursday, October 19, 1967)

Let us for a moment imagine the case of a child born into an environment of poverty and despair in Wilmington.

Growing up in a household where the father is out of work and receiving welfare—if in fact there is a father there at all—and in which the mother is working long hours for little pay—if she is working at all—the child is on his own. He plays in the streets, in rat-infested back alleys and in filth. Where else is there to play? He attends school, but his background is so deprived that even the most basic concepts in the Dick-and-Jane reader are beyond his comprehension. The teacher has no time to give him the special help he needs, for he is one of 30 or 40 children in her class. He falls further and further behind academically and consequently he loses interest.

At the same time he sometimes watches television. He sees how other people live, and he wants it. The idea of having some money in his pocket to buy a car and play a little grows more and more attractive. The benefits of education seem more and more obscure. He drops out of school and soon finds he cannot get a job, or if he can that it pays him very little.

One muggy August evening he is standing around when suddenly some one tosses a brick. He tosses one too. He gets away with it. But not long after he gets in trouble with the law, for the temptations of crime prove too much for him, and he spends more and more time in a state-supported correctional institution. Soon he, like his father, is on welfare, again being carried by the taxpayers. He fathers a number of children, children who like himself are destined to require public help in any number of ways during their lives. Once again, society has lost. More important, a human being has lost.

This example can be multiplied by thousands right here in our city. This is not only Harlem or Watts. It is Wilmington. It is one example of the urban problem, the problem of the cities, a problem of poverty, inequality, lack of opportunity—all of which leads to frustration.

We have seen this year more dramatically and more destructively than ever what the consequences of this unbroken cycle are. This in spite of the fact that many efforts have been made in our city and elsewhere.

It has gotten to the point where many people, including some dedicated to solving these problems, throw up their hands and say there is no answer. I say: there *has* to be an answer.

It is true that much is being done and much more has been anticipated to combat urban problems. In two of the three fundamental areas—namely housing and employment—there is hope that we are reaching toward meaningful levels of accomplishment. Programs for low-cost housing, increased job opportunities, and recreational sites, plus legislation in the civil rights field, will help. But while such good works are essential, and require expansion and improvement, they are basically firefighting operations rather than long-range solutions.

What is the long-range solution? What is the thing that could do the most effective job of solving the problems of our cities? I submit it lies in the early development of the child through special and effective educational programs that really emphasize individual attention to the child.

In his Chicago studies, Bloom found that intelligence patterns are 50 per cent established by age 4 and 80 per cent established by age 8. Obviously, then, this is the area in which we must work the hardest. We must compensate for environmental deficiencies by

providing a total education not simply academic in nature.

Communication is the key. As Dr. Earl Jackson of Wilmington's Bancroft School says: "We learn to read in grades one through three, then we read to learn."

We need a program that includes strong emphasis on health, basic living tools, language arts, and broadened experiences. The fact of the matter is we have to concentrate our efforts on these four to eight-year-olds.

Such a program requires large amounts of additional money. It makes financial sense because it will cost far less to solve the problem now than later. These are kids who above all deserve a chance in this life. These are people, not statistics. To fail to take this opportunity now, is to mass-produce children who will be problems for society their entire lives, and the problem snowballs as population grows.

What is being done in this field today? What has been learned that we can apply here in Wilmington?

One national pioneer effort has been Operation Headstart, one of the few successful efforts in the "War on Poverty." Headstart, as you know, began on a summer basis with pre-school youngsters, attempting to prepare them for school. Generally, it involves children between three and five years old. The summer programs now serve about 500,000 children, the full-year programs about 200,000.

Mr. Jule Sugarman, director of Headstart, testified before a U.S. Senate committee last June on this program and had the following to say about its success:

"... In general, the research says the child who comes into Headstart is substantially below the advantaged child in his development. If you use a scale of 100, he is down somewhere around 80 or 85. After he has been in Headstart, he is up to the 90 to 95 range. He is below the average child, but still significantly better than when he came into the program."

Mr. Sugarman also noted that "... it is particularly true that the child who was the worst off when he started is one who gains the most in the program. . . ."

But let us consider what Mr. Sugarman had to say next for this is important in terms of the long-range solution.

"After the child has been out of Headstart for a few months or a year he tends to lose some of the gains he has achieved during the Headstart program, a fact which we attribute largely to the kind of program into which he goes in the school system, whether it be kindergarten or first grade. He does not slip back to his original level, but he does not maintain the level of gain that he first achieved in the program."

A little later in his testimony, Mr. Sugarman says that his office anticipates this kind of assistance is necessary through the third grade, although not as many children may need this much.

Further evidence comes from Jeanne S. Park, an information officer in HEW's Office of Education, writing in the American School Board Journal last August. She wrote:

"Research has demonstrated that the gains which children make in Head Start classes often are lost in the transition to classroom work in regular schools, unless the schools also provide special attention."

So Headstart by itself will just not answer the problem.

Recognizing this, the Office of Economic Opportunity is working on a new program called Follow Through, designed to pick up where Headstart leaves off. It has begun this fall in a limited version in 30 communities, involving some 3,000 children and costing 3 million federal dollars. It begins in a major way next fall when it will involve 190,000 children and 120 million federal dollars. Communities will be encouraged to experi-

ment. None of these pilot programs is operating in Delaware.

Another way in which the federal government participates in this kind of work is through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title I of that act deals with education of children of low-income families.

Perhaps the most interesting, and most controversial, program of all is operating in 21 schools in New York City, where it began three years ago. It is called the More Effective Schools, or MES, program.

It is a total program from pre-kindergarten through the entire elementary school. Its key concept is individual attention and total education. In pre-kindergarten, there are no more than 15 pupils per class. There are three teachers per class. In kindergarten, there are no more than 20 pupils per class. There are two teachers per class. In grades one through six, there are no more than 22 pupils per class. There are four teachers for three classes.

Also, there is a full-time health counselor, three full-time guidance counselors, one full-time psychologist, one part-time psychiatrist, junior guidance classes, and a full-time social worker. There also are teaching specialists in reading, math, art, audio-visual work, science, music, and English language available to all children.

I noted that this program is controversial. This is so because of serious differences of opinion over its effectiveness. There is no question that it has brought many benefits. Teachers like to teach in this program. Parents are happier too. Discipline problems are fewer. Absenteeism is lower. There is an improved atmosphere. But this is a program that costs twice as much per student as the regular program, and such expenditure requires proof of academic achievement also. Here is where the controversy exists.

One report was in a recent Wall Street Journal article on MES, where it noted that "in standard tests given last April, second and third grade pupils in the 21 MES schools displayed reading ability at the national norm or above. . . . In 240 other slum-area schools in New York, by contrast, second-graders were five to six months behind norms in reading developments, while third-graders lagged even more."

But on the other side we cannot ignore a study released last week by the Center for Urban Education, a federally-financed researched and education agency. This study said that while there are many side benefits of the MES program—a better atmosphere, better discipline, et cetera—the children do not test significantly higher. The problem, according to those who made this study, is that teachers need special training to teach in such a program. With imaginative training, the people who made the study feel such a program would have a real chance of success.

Many cities have begun a campaign for MES-type education. The McCone Commission, in its Watts report, said that this was the only type of program that could succeed there.

California, according to a June report in the Christian Science Monitor, is involved in this so-called compensatory education. Here is a comment by Dr. Wilson C. Riles, who heads that program:

"We didn't expect any gains in so short a time. The amazing thing to me is that we made some. Youngsters in the first semester made one month's gain for every month of the program."

"That may not sound like anything special. But before, those same kids were making only  $\frac{1}{12}$  of a month's gain for each month in school. That means they were falling steadily behind everybody else month by month. By the time some of them got to high school, they were three or four years behind."



"Our program so far hasn't closed that gap. But it shows we could stop the backward drift. It prevented them from falling still further behind."

In Pittsburgh, they are using lower pupil-teacher ratios, team teaching, preprimary education to prepare slum children for early grades, and a 4½ day week 11 months of the year.

With all this as background, I'd now like to return to Wilmington and discuss a possible program for this city.

I propose that the Wilmington schools take on a project in this area that we might call catch-up education. I would propose that one school be selected, a school where 50 per cent or more of the children are in the poverty or disadvantaged category. Let's take the children between four and eight years of age, which means adding a new grade level for the four-year-olds. Let's make kindergarten a full instead of half-day program, which means doubling the program for five-year-olds. Let's reduce class sizes in the first three grades to about half of what they are now; namely, one professional working with 15 youngsters rather than 30 or 35. Let's extend the school year for these children to 11 months, which means adding six weeks to the present school year. Let us keep in the back of our minds, as another possibility, the idea of extending the school day from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m. And let us try to involve the parents of these children as much as possible.

Then, let us do what the gentlemen who made the New York study recommended to me: provide special and imaginative training for the teachers in this program so as to reach maximum effectiveness in the small classes, individual instruction, etc.

Let us see whether this works, on a demonstration basis. I believe it would be a national first. And, if necessary, I feel that federal demonstration project funds might be available to help us out.

It might range from \$150,000 to \$450,000 depending upon the school selected. It would certainly be worthwhile to see if we can make this work here.

If catch-up does work after a year's operation, then we had better be prepared to take the bull by the horns and find the funds to do the job in the whole city of Wilmington.

What are we talking about in terms of a full-fledged program? If we consider Wilmington elementary schools where at least 50 per cent of the children at a poverty or disadvantaged level, we are talking about eight schools and 5,000 children between ages four and eight. To provide smaller classes and an extended school year I am told, would mean about \$450 per pupil over and above the current cost of about \$560. This does not include additional building space.

Total cost would be slightly over \$2 million.—This does not include special teacher training or added physical plant.

It is noteworthy that the Delaware committee studying causes of civil unrest, in its recent report on education, recommended establishment of state-supported kindergartens, that Headstart be made a permanent federally-financed program for a full school day and all year around, and that additional teachers be allotted to schools with children having special needs. Thus, this committee recognized the need and has gone part of the way.

I think it is obvious that Wilmington cannot alone undertake the financing of such a large program. The federal government, and the state government, will have to participate.

We shall also need the support—and I mean the full and energetic support—of all the leadership available to us. This will be crucial if it is to come to pass.

We obviously need support also from civic

and community groups, such as your Committee of 39, and elected officials at all levels.

And finally, it must be done on an absolutely nonpartisan basis.

Let us try this out on a demonstration basis. For we need this kind of program here. We must determine soon whether this will work. If it does, we must have the courage, intelligence and boldness to part with a sizeable piece of our national and local treasure in order to preserve that treasure later on. That treasure obviously is both economic and human.

We should do it for humanitarian reasons because it is the right thing to do. We should do it for financial reasons, because it will save us money in the long run. If we want to live together successfully in this city and nation, we had best get on with the job.

We live in a time when men talk of going to the moon. We must apply the same energy, talent and resources to a more critical program, that of improving the lives and opportunities of all Americans.

Among all cities, Wilmington should have the capacity to solve its problems. If we here can't do it, and I know we can, then it is difficult to conceive of this nation as a whole doing it—Thank you.

#### PRESERVATION OF WILDLIFE GAINS NEW FRIEND: NBC NEWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the last few decades there has been a rapid increase of interest on the part of all Americans in the preservation of endangered species such as the disappearing American bison and the spectacular whooping crane. It was front-page news recently that at Patuxent Wildlife Research Center a number of whooping crane eggs have been artificially hatched, providing new hopes and possibilities for the continuation of this greatly endangered species.

This interest and concern are, in part, a result of long-term dedicated work by such great conservationists as former President Theodore Roosevelt and his helper, Gov. Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania; and by John Muir and cartoonist "Ding" Darling. But, even more, this public concern is the result of an increasing attention being paid to conservation and wildlife preservation by concerned American news media.

I take this occasion to thank heartily those news writers and news reporters who have played so essential and commendable a part in bringing into the public eye the dangers which are faced by our American wildlife and endangered species throughout the world. Especially I wish to thank the managers and writers of NBC News Service, which on Friday, September 29, 1967, presented to the American public a report on American wildlife which will live in the minds of its viewers for months to come.

In "American Profile: Our Endangered Wildlife," Ed Cobb, whose "Mark Twain" series has educated the American public in the wonders of our natural world, narrated the story of our present battle in this country to save endangered species in the face of great industrial growth and change.

Included in this documentary are the vital, and frightening, needs for greater protection of the dainty Florida key deer, the disappearing timber wolf, and the recently rediscovered ivory bill wood-

pecker of the Big Thicket areas of Texas. I have mentioned on the floor of the Senate this great event in the annals of wildlife research, the recent reported sighting of this species which has long been thought extinct, and I have expressed my great concern for the adequate protection of this bird. I repeat on this occasion that this and like endangered species must be preserved for future generations of Americans, as well as for ourselves.

In this excellent documentary on American species, NBC notes in the words of one of Conservation's great men, Dr. Aldo Leopold, of the University of California at Berkeley, that:

For one species to mourn the death of another is a new thing under the sun. We who have lost our (passenger) pigeons mourn the loss. Had the funeral been ours, the pigeon would hardly have mourned us. In this fact, rather than in nylons or atomic bombs, lies evidence of our superiority over the beasts.

In this statement lies the essential quality of the conservation movement: It demands the inspiration of its followers with an esteem for the natural world of which we are a part. Without this inspiration of which only man is capable, conservationists would go begging; there would be no American bison, no whooping crane, there would remain no more bald eagle, the symbol of our Nation. But this has not happened, greatly to the credit of all Americans, and greatly to the credit of a concerned and involved American news service. For with the appearance of such a program as this by NBC News, Americans are again advised of the progress, and the remaining needs, of their efforts to preserve their fellow species; and by this report they again receive the appeal to notice, and to care about, the wildlife which they encounter seldom in the midst of urbanized modern living.

I have sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 for the purpose of convening a World Conference on the Conservation of Wildlife; I encourage the passage in the near future of my Big Thicket National Park bill, S. 4, which would preserve the habitat of the greatly endangered ivory bill woodpecker.

It is by such legislation as this that we in Congress can work toward the preservation of the natural world in which we live, and can show our esteem for the works of creation.

My Correspondence from Texas and across the Nation convinces me that this is a cause very dear to the hearts of Americans everywhere. And such reports as NBC's "Our Endangered Wildlife" encourage my belief that this situation and this need are recognized by the most important forces, the most essential register, of our Nation's outlook on the world, and her concern for the world of the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the NBC program "Our Endangered Wildlife" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcription was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:



# AMERICAN PROFILE: "OUR ENDANGERED WILDLIFE"

(Transcription from tape of an NBC News documentary which appeared Friday, September 29, 1967)

VOICE. "American Profile," the first of a series of documentary glimpses of the continent on which we live; brought to you by American Iron and Steel Institute. Look for the steel mark on things you buy. Today and tomorrow steel makes things better for you; and by New York Life Insurance Company. The New York Life agent in your community is a good man to know.

[Commercial.]

VOICE. Now to narrate this special NBC News Report on "Our Endangered Wildlife," here is artist and conservationist Ed Dodd, creator of "Mark Trail."

Mr. Ed Dodd. I'd like to show you a book. It hasn't been published, and it won't be. The title is "Rare and Endangered Fish and Wildlife in the United States." Its cover is red, denoting danger. Inside are reports on 323 wildlife creatures: mammals on salmon pink; birds on green; reptiles and amphibians on yellow; and fishes on blue.

More than 300 individuals and organizations, all specializing in wildlife studies, were consulted to prepare that preliminary report; and from it has been distilled a master list of seventy-eight species threatened with extinction. This is a frightening number, in light of our past record. In what we might call modern times, we have seen the passing—to mention only a few—we have seen the passing of the Great Auk, the Heath Hen, the Sea Mink, the Carolina Parakeet, the Labrador Duck, Steller's Sea Cow, the Mammoth, and, to mention the classic example of destruction, the Passenger Pigeon.

In the early 1800's there were billions of passenger pigeons in the United States, perhaps 5 billion. The passenger pigeon was edible and available, and vast flocks were slaughtered indiscriminately.

On September 1st, 1914, the last of the passenger pigeons died at the Cincinnati Zoological Gardens. The bird was a female named Martha. There is much dispute about her age, and what caused her death. All that is really of little value. The point is that she was the last of a species. She stands mummified now at the Smithsonian Institution, mute in death, yet speaking volumes on the foolishness of man.

And we did nearly the same thing with the buffalo—the American bison—and in the same time period. At the end of the Civil War in 1865 four massive herds of buffalo covered the Plains, from the Canadian border to deep into Texas. There were tens of millions of them. Then two great transcontinental railroads were pushed across the nation, followed by settlers and cities and vast expansion. Between 1865 and 1883, in the short period of eighteen years, these herds were reduced from millions to only 740.

The first real wildlife conservation program in the United States was started then, and the buffalo was snatched from the brink of extinction. It had been close, and we had learned a lesson.

But the growth of the United States has been inexorable. And with that growth, other wildlife creatures have been placed in danger of extinction. Seventy-eight in all. Last February, following the passage of the Endangered Species Preservation Act by Congress, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall released the first list: fourteen mammals, thirty-six birds, six reptiles and amphibians, and twenty-two fishes.

The powerful grizzly bear is on that list. So is the black-footed ferret, who must feed on the rapidly vanishing prairie dog. So is the Ivory-billed woodpecker. It's so rare it was feared extinct, until just recently when three pair were sighted in the big thicket country of eastern Texas. On the list also is the Ne-Ne Goose, the state bird of Hawaii.

It is a tragic fact that half of the thirty-six birds on the list are Hawaiian birds. And on the list, too, is the diminutive Key Deer of Florida.

These are the Florida Keys. They're strung together like pearls from the southern tip of the nation. They are the home of the Key Deer, the smallest member of the deer family.

The Key Deer is only about 30 inches high at the shoulders. It's a hardy animal. It can live on harsh, salty vegetation. It can drink brackish water most other animals would refuse. It can swim the waters of the Atlantic from island to island. It can endure the fury of hurricanes.

But the Key Deer has had trouble adapting itself to man. Speeding cars ran it down. Hunters with dogs and jacklights cornered it and shot it. Poachers in boats took advantage of its helplessness while swimming and clubbed it to death. Home builders destroyed its vegetation.

Twenty years ago the Key Deer had diminished almost to the vanishing point. The alarm was sounded. Conservationists and wildlife organizations joined with the Federal Government to establish a natural refuge. The location is Monroe County in the Florida Keys. With that help the Key Deer is coming back. But it still could be wiped out.

Refuge Manager Jack Watson, who can safely be described as a "tough cookie," is the Key Deer's resident protector.

Mr. JACK WATSON. This is the reason the Key Deer Refuge was started, to protect this specimen of white-tailed deer. We first made the original survey to see what the deer population was in '48; and at that time, we came up with an estimated fifty deer, on five islands. Today, we have approximately 400 deer, and they're on eighteen islands.

The deer have come up due to protection more than anything. They have plenty of food on the islands, and plenty of fresh water. All they needed was protection. We have lost on the average of thirty deer a year to automobiles. And we know that we lose a few to the hunters, the poachers. We keep both a boat patrol, a plane, and road patrols going for near twenty-four hours a day, although they still keep trying.

We have no predators other than man and automobile on these deer. There are no big cats in this area. So, we don't have to worry about that. Man and automobile is all we have to worry about.

Mr. DODD. All we have to worry about: man and automobiles. In truth, Jack Watson puts it somewhat less delicately in private conversation. He protects the Key Deer day in and day out with a fierce determination. As he drives through the Key Deer National Refuge, he knows the battle is a never-ending one.

Mr. WATSON. This area over in here used to be deer habitat, but now it's turned into this big development here. Pretty near every piece of property they've got in there has been sold. There have been quite a number of houses built down in this section of it.

This privately owned land here is under lease to the government, and the owner receives fire protection and against people stealing palms and palmettos out of the area. This land on both sides of the road here is owned by the National Audubon Society, and they have leased it to the government for ten years.

This is another subdivision that covers about 800 acres, and this is a typical house that you will find springing up in these subdivision areas. And these will eventually take over all the deer space, and therefore we're going to have to acquire some of the outer islands for the deer to move out to when this transition takes place on all this building.

Mr. DODD. And so Jack Watson goes about his job of protecting the Key Deer. He believes his native toughness in his tender care of "Bucky" and "Bubbles," two deer badly in-

jured by automobiles and nursed back to health.

The most urgent measure needed to preserve the Key Deer is federal acquisition of natural habitat. This must be done while land can still be acquired. Some of this is being done, but slowly.

It seems possible that the development and occupation of the Florida Keys by man may eventually drive the Key Deer out. Already some conservationists have suggested that the Key Deer be transplanted. They are hardy and could possibly do well in almost any place. But that would take them out of their natural habitat, and that's a move always fraught with danger.

Actually, great progress has been made in less than twenty years in building up the herd. But the tiny Key Deer still faces the danger of extinction. Some men still poach. Some men still drive too fast through the refuge. But others, like Jack Watson, protect. And it's those men who are determined to prevail.

[Commercial.]

Mr. DODD. This is the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center at Laurel, Maryland. It's a facility of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior. It's also the headquarters of the endangered wildlife research program. Among other things, the scientists here are trying to save the whooping crane, a classic case in conservation circles.

The more plentiful sandhill crane, grey instead of white, was used as a stand-in. In six years of preliminary study, a breeding stock of sandhills was established. It was felt that those successful experiments pointed the way to saving the whooper; and that was to restock the whooping crane in the wild, just as we do with quail and pheasant.

Dr. Ray Erickson, seen here in the coat, is the director of this research, and all endangered species research. His assistant is Glen Smart. Together with colleagues in Canada, they are writing the latest chapter in the dramatic Whooping Crane story.

But first, the background. The whooping crane is the tallest of American birds. Some say it is the most majestic. Certainly it's spectacular in flight. At last count, there were forty-three in the wild and nine in captivity. That's a total of fifty-two. It's hoped that another survey later in the year will find several more young birds in the Canadian breeding grounds.

The whooping crane winters in the United States on the 47,000 acre Aransas National Wildlife Refuge. It's located about seventy-five miles north of Corpus Christi, Texas. In the spring the giant birds migrate north, flying 2,000 miles to Wood Buffalo National Park in the Canadian Northwest Territories.

On both ends of the map, the protection vigil is unending. In Aransas, wardens pay constant attention to the welfare of the whooping cranes. Without this care, there is little doubt that the giant bird would pass from our wildlife scene.

In 1945, as the whooping crane captured the public conscience, the National Audubon Society joined forces with the federal government in what was called a cooperative whooping crane project. That seemed to be the turning point. The joint project called forth the Society's research director, Robert Porter Allen. He was one of those dedicated men who seem to people every major conservation program. Although there were many others who helped, it was Allen who was the catalyst for action.

It was the persistence of Allen that led to the discovery of the whooping crane's breeding grounds in Canada. That was in June of 1955, and it was a major breakthrough in the research.

Allen is gone now. He died of a heart attack in 1963. But if the whooping crane survives, that survival will be a monument to Robert Porter Allen. The responsibility has passed to other hands now; to Dr. Ray Erick-



son and his associates on both sides of the Canadian border. This year they took a major step forward. Dr. Erickson explains.

Dr. RAY ERICKSON. We picked up six eggs in Wood Buffalo National Park in Northwest Territories, Canada. In the incubator at Patuxent, we had them tied down with rubber bands to hold them in place because an incubator is not built for whooping crane eggs. It was built for much smaller eggs, such as domestic poultry. And we had to do this because the cylinder of trays would turn 90 degrees in each direction, and there was danger that they might fall out.

The first visual indication of hatching came when they pipped, the first one on the ninth of June; and this is a little eruption from inside the egg in which the egg shell is cracked out in one place. The bird then proceeds over a period of about twelve hours to continue the job, until finally they emerge when the larger end of the egg shell is broken or pushed out.

As they began pipping, we moved them down to a lower compartment in the incubator called the hatching compartment; and there the youngsters struggled out of their egg shells. The birds were allowed to remain in the hatching compartment for about twenty-four to thirty-six hours. And as soon as they were fluffy and ready to leave this compartment, we put them into 4x2-foot compartments with a heat lamp, and where they were able to walk around and exercise.

The birds remained in these compartments almost another day before they were given their first meal. At this time, of course, they were living on the egg yolk sac, with which birds are born, and which tides them over until they can adapt to food that is available.

We fed them a turkey starter mash, fortified with vitamins, minerals; and they also particularly enjoyed the meal worm supplement. These are live meal worms.

We had these birds locked away from any intrusion other than by the people who were taking care of them. Therefore these shrouds to camouflage the human form, to prevent the birds from becoming imprinted or given an early impression of the human form as opposed to the form of their mother, which they would have seen in the wild. It may have been important to prevent a fixation on humans so that later on when they paired, they would not reproduce in captivity.

They remained indoors for about three weeks. After that we moved them out of doors and they were able to get more sunshine and catch insects and get much more exercise. We feel we have been extremely fortunate the first year. However, we have left room for improvement in subsequent years, if it is decided to go ahead with additional egg pick ups. We hope to develop a flock of ten or twelve breeding pairs which will produce youngsters that can be returned to the wild to bolster the wild population, or possibly to start new breeding populations, in Canada.

However, a much deeper issue is at stake, a moral one. I think we're fortunate to be living in a period when man is reducing his destruction of habitat and of these species and stopping awhile to say that it's about time we try to save rather than exploit.

Mr. Dobb. These baby whooping cranes point up the importance of the work at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center. But the Interior Department must go to Congress for funding. In the budget for fiscal 1968, the President asked for \$694,000 for endangered species research. When the appropriations bill was finally enacted, that figure had been cut by \$150,000.

Another item in the President's budget was lost entirely. That was \$750,000 for acquisition of additional land in Maryland for wildlife research. Thus, current funding for

endangered species research totals \$544,000. It means simply that certain phases of the study will have to be postponed.

For some of the seventy-eight wildlife creatures, time may have already run out.

[Commercial.]

Mr. Dobb. Concern for the wildlife creatures around us is not a new thing. There were laws in 1623 in the Plymouth Colony dealing with hunting and fishing rights. Other laws providing a certain amount of protection for deer go back almost as far. Yet we must understand that it wasn't until this century that the wildlife conservation movement was born.

In the year 1901, the National Audubon Society came into being as a strong private voice for conservation. The same year saw Theodore Roosevelt become President of the United States, and the President and the Society joined hands.

Roosevelt established the first wildlife refuge. He took the lead in removing our natural resources—timberland, waterways, mineral deposits, and game animals—from the control of private speculators.

Under the guidance of forester Gifford Pinchot, later to become the Governor of Pennsylvania, the chief executive established the Inland Waterways Commission and the National Conservation Commission. And under Roosevelt and Pinchot the national forest system was established. Today it consists of over 180 million acres.

It wasn't until the year of 1916 that the National Park Service was established. And it wasn't until the 1930's that "Ding" Darling, the Pulitzer prize-winning cartoonist, came onto the conservation scene. He was chief of what was then called the Bureau of Biological Survey; and he pioneered in the conservation of game birds. He set aside more than 3 million acres of public land as wildlife refuges; and it was "Ding" Darling who helped found what is now the National Wildlife Federation, another powerful citizens' voice in wildlife preservation. Indeed, it has only been since World War II that there has been wide acceptance of the new science called "wildlife management."

It was only in the latter part of 1966 that President Johnson instructed the Interior Department to take action to protect wildlife species in danger of extinction. The action is cooperative, of course. The Interior Department could never do it alone, and doesn't.

The story of the Kirtland's Warbler provides an example of that cooperation. This tiny song bird is in danger of extinction. Its numbers are less than 1,000. It has become, in a management sense, the responsibility of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

In 1963, the Forest Service set aside a Kirtland's Warbler Management Area in the Huron National Forest, 4,000 acres near Mio, Michigan. Management is necessary because the scientists have learned that the Kirtland's Warbler cannot survive unless it has young pack-pine trees for shade and shelter.

So, when the warbler migrates to its winter quarters in the Bahama Islands, the Forest Service rangers set fire to the management area. Forest fires are usually tragic things, but here control fire is used for good.

The rangers set a "fire in a box," and they watch it carefully from the ground and from the air. Research has shown that this burning brings renewed life to the jack-pine. The tree needs the heat of fire to open its cones; to spill out its seed; to grow new trees, young trees that are absolutely vital to the survival of the Kirtland's Warbler.

Out of the fire comes new life, new life for the jack-pine, and new life for the little warbler.

The protection and management of the Kirtland's Warbler is not complete. Much study is needed of the wintering areas in the Bahamas; and it is obvious that authori-

ties in the Bahamas must give the tiny bird the same protection that it now has in the United States. The Florida Audubon Society is working on that.

That's one look at wildlife management. It is a science that has been pioneered by Dr. Aldo Leopold, professor of zoology at the University of California at Berkeley. Last July he was appointed chief scientist of the National Park Service, and charged with advising the Park Service on programs for management of resources.

It was a fortunate appointment in that Dr. Leopold is not a pessimist about man's relationship with the animals. He knows that our wildlife heritage can be saved, saved by intelligent men. Some years back, in commenting on the extinction of the passenger pigeon, Aldo Leopold wrote:

"For one species to mourn the death of another is a new thing under the sun. We who have lost our pigeons mourn the loss. Had the funeral been ours, the pigeon would hardly have mourned us. In this fact, rather than in nylons or atomic bombs, lies evidence of our superiority over the beasts."

[Commercial.]

Mr. Dobb. This is Isle Royale, Michigan, forty-five miles long, nine miles wide, 210 square miles of almost total wilderness in northwestern Lake Superior.

Since 1940, it has been a national park.

It is seventy miles from upper Michigan's copper country, and eighteen miles from the nearest point in Minnesota. The Canadian shores loom on the horizon. There are no telephones on the island, no roads, no automobiles, no television. It's a remote area of great beauty, and of considerable importance to the endangered species research.

Here, in what is a natural wildlife laboratory, there is a big moose herd, some 700 strong. The moose in themselves are not endangered; but they are the catalyst for the research.

In the 1930's, the herd had grown to perhaps 3,000. They over-browsed the island; literally ate themselves into starvation, and hundreds died. About 1948, as the plants on which the moose feed were making another recovery, the timberwolf was introduced into the environment. That set up the circumstances for important research on predator-prey relationships. The research is important too because the timber wolf is an endangered species. Less than 1,000 of them are known to exist in the Chippewa and Superior National Forest in Minnesota. The encroachment of civilization drove the timber wolf into these tiny pockets of wilderness. Heavy hunting and trapping pressure for bounties almost finished the job of extinction. The pressure, as we shall see, is not yet ended.

The research on the wolf and its prey on Isle Royale started in 1958, on a cooperative agreement between Purdue University and the National Park Service. The bulk of the study is done during the winter, when there are no visitors on the island, and when it is easy to spot the wolves against the white mantle of snow. Surveys are taken from the air, and flights are made every day that the weather allows.

And when a moose kill is spotted the plane is landed nearby and the researcher snowshoes to the spot to get a close look at the remains.

The wolf is an efficient predator, and very little evidence of its kill is left behind to study.

The director of the research project is Dr. Durward Allen, professor of Wildlife Ecology at Purdue University. He talked to producer Chet Hagan.

Prof. DURWARD ALLEN. Since our studies began in June of '58 there appears to have been a—quite a nice relationship—you could call it a balance if you want to, though it's not a strict balance—between the wolf population and the moose herd and the vegetation. As of mid-winter our moose herd probably is between 600 and 700 animals, and it's



stayed that way. The wolf population is about twenty-five, give or take two or three or four each year. And so we have apparently a moose herd that is being held at this level by a population of wolves that runs about one per ten square miles—and that's a lot of wolves; and they're living on moose, and some beaver; and they are protecting the vegetation of the island from being over-browsed by another big build-up of moose; which means they're keeping the moose in business. Otherwise the moose would undoubtedly go through this same over-population and reduction that we saw earlier.

Mr. CHET HAGAN. Now, this is done naturally. There is no man hunting in that—Professor ALLEN. No.

Mr. HAGAN [continuing]. . . national park at all?

Professor ALLEN. In national parks we don't meddle with such things, and this is a natural condition, and we have followed it now summer and winter, over the past ten years. The killing of moose is not a random thing at all. It's—these wolves try about a dozen moose, or they'll investigate about a dozen moose, before they find one that they obviously can sense is vulnerable. The adult moose that are killed are nearly all over five, and most of them over six years old; mostly around ten years old, in fact, on the average. Many of them show conditions of disability; lumpy jaw, or lungs loaded up with tapeworms, cysts, or something like this.

Mr. HAGAN. Is there really a balance of nature?

Professor ALLEN. I like to think that there is because in all communities, all communities tend toward a condition of stability. Unless a wild community is stable, something happens to it. It's destroyed. So that things come together, and they go through a stage of trial and error, and the animals that have a function, that permit them to survive there, will survive, and others won't. If you want to call that a balance of nature it's all right, but I don't use the term because so many people misinterpret it. They give it some strange Mother Goose connotation that over-simplifies our entire picture of the natural world, and there has been so much of this done that I like to talk about the stability of natural communities. Even that is only a relative thing, because animal populations vary from here to here, and still they'll trend back toward the intermediate condition, and the community will stay there and not be destroyed.

Mr. DONN. One of Dr. Allen's researchers on Isle Royale has been Dr. David Mech, who lives now in the suburbs of Minneapolis with wife, children, and two young wolves named "Thunder" and "Lightning". The presence of the wolves in the Mech backyard is symbolic perhaps of his insistence that the wolf is harmless to humans, and must be saved from extinction.

In Minnesota he has had a chance to fight for that point of view, because it is in Minnesota which has the only sizable population of wolves left in the United States that the bounty battle is fought with regularity and much heat. Northern Minnesota legislators want the bounty reimposed. Mech was asked whether the bounty is valid.

Dr. DAVID MECH. No, in general the bounty doesn't even accomplish what it is supposed to; that is, it doesn't even help reduce or exterminate the species on which it is imposed. But with the timber wolf, I am afraid that it might be successful; and that's because the timber wolf occurs in such low densities—remember, not more than one wolf per ten square miles. And that fact, coupled with the modern technological advances in killing animals, like the use of the aircraft, snowmobiles, snares, and things like this—possibly even poisons—well, these coupled with a high bounty perhaps could exterminate the timber wolf in Minnesota.

Mr. HAGAN. Let me be the devil's advocate for a moment. Don't the wolves here in Minnesota kill pretty many deer, and leave fewer deer for the hunger?

Dr. MECH. Well, that's what people think; a certain segment of the public thinks this. However, people don't realize that whether or not there are wolves around a deer herd, every deer herd has a very high annual mortality, and in places where there are timber wolves it appears that the wolves are just taking the place of other mortality factors.

Now, I checked the five major timber wolf counties in Minnesota, and found that the hunter success rate for each of those counties averaged higher than the statewide average. The statewide average was 44 per cent; that is, 44 per cent of the hunters filled out their licenses. Whereas in the five major timber wolf counties an average of 51 per cent of the hunters filled out their licenses. It certainly doesn't look to me like this is any indication that the wolves are hurting the deer hunting.

Mr. HAGAN. Might it indicate exactly the opposite?

Dr. MECH. Possibly, and for this reason: We have found from other studies that in places where the timber wolves are harvesting a fair amount of the deer—of a prey population; for instance, on Isle Royale—there has been a corresponding increase in the reproductive rate of the prey population. So, to go back to Isle Royale for a moment, before there were wolves, it was very rare to find any twin calves in the moose herds. However, now that there are wolves on Isle Royale, in the summer we have found as high as 38 per cent of the cows that had calves had twins; and it appears to us that this is probably a result of the timber wolves culling out the older, less productive animals, and therefore stimulating the reproduction.

Mr. DONN. In the north country of Minnesota the views on wolves are totally different. In Bemidji, State Representative Leonard Dickinson is an outspoken advocate for the bounty on predators. He says his constituents are angered by the defeat of his bounty bill in the Legislature.

Representative LEONARD DICKINSON. They were unhappy—when I say "they" I mean I'm speaking for 90 per cent of the people who live in this northern area; not in just this particular area, but all the northern cut-over area. Well, for instance, I talked to a Watkins man the other day, and he's already printed some little placards: "No bounty, no hunting," and he's selling these things like mad to all these farmers and these—even with his orders, they're putting them up saying "No bounty, no hunting," and they mean business. You don't have to—I don't—

Mr. HAGAN. In other words, they're posting their land.

Mr. DICKINSON. They really are. They just feel—figure that someone has stepped on their toes, and not knowing the whole picture. There are two sides to this thing. It bothers them.

Mr. HAGAN. Well, on the other side of the coin, Mr. Dickinson, the conservationists contend that the wolf takes only the very young or the very old in the deer herd, sort of leaving the survival of the fittest. What do you think about that?

Mr. DICKINSON. Well, they should know better. That just definitely will not hold water. It just will not hold water. I wouldn't say they wouldn't pick a sick deer or a wounded deer or a very young deer, but you've got to remember that most of the big deer kill is in the deep snow. When your crust comes on the snow, a deer cannot possibly get away from a timber wolf, or a flock of wolves. It's impossible. I have good people who have testified before our Game and Fish Committee that they find as many as twenty carcasses within just a small area of where timber wolves have taken that many, and

they'll take the last one. They're killers. They kill by instinct. And I don't think people understand that. These people who are talking of preserving the timber wolf as a hereditary thing don't know the past history of the timber wolf. They're just blank. I hate to say that. They fail to face up to reality.

Mr. DONN. And so the controversy over the timber wolf continues in Minnesota. It's a perfect illustration of the difficulties inherent in wild life conservation. In this case, the endangered species is not a pretty bird, nor a tiny deer, but a timber wolf; and our childhood fairy-tale training about the big bad wolf dies hard.

[Commercial.]

Mr. DONN. The bald eagle has been the symbol of the United States since the nation's earliest days, but has not been universally loved. Benjamin Franklin, who wanted the wild turkey as the national symbol, complained that the bald eagle was a bird of "bad moral character, generally poor and often very lousy."

Franklin's views were not accepted, however, and as the United States grew in esteem, so did the fierce-eyed majestic bald eagle.

Today, it's an endangered species. In truth, it's the Southern bald eagle in danger of extinction. Actually, it differs from the Northern bald eagle only in size, being slightly smaller. There are only 1,500 of the Southern bald eagles south of the Canadian border.

We might have been years delayed in our realization of the plight of the bald eagle if it had not been for the late Charles L. Broley. He was a retired banker from Canada who started research on the bald eagle at the age of 58. He began his studies in 1939, for the National Audubon Society. He turned in—to use his own words—"enthusiastic reports about eagles nesting successfully everywhere along the Florida west coast, from Tampa to Fort Myers." By 1946, he was banding 150 young eagles a season. Then he began to note a decline, and by 1950, he was able to band only twenty-four young birds.

Broley sounded the alarm and continued his work. He made all his own tree-climbing equipment, including the slingshot apparatus that enabled him to fire a four-ounce weight attached to a strong fish-line up into the tall eagle trees.

Then, to the end of the line, he attached a strong rope to haul up a ladder. When the ladder was in place, the dangling end of the rope was tied securely around the base of the tree.

Then came the climb. Broley was seventy-four years old when these superb pictures were made by Bayard Read of the Department of Ornithology at Cornell University. Broley was called the "eagle man" by all who knew him. And he would keep himself in condition for these climbs by chinning himself fifteen times every day on a car in his car shed.

Not every nest could be reached from the first ladder. Sometimes the bottoms of the bigger nests effectively blocked Broley. So he would throw a rope over the nest, and haul up a smaller ladder, which would swing free high above the ground. But it enabled him to reach his goal.

The goal was always the same for Charles Broley. An eaglet to band. And once it was banded, other eagle-watchers would begin to get new knowledge on the extent of the eagle's life.

In his twenty years of work, Charles Broley banded more than 1,200 eaglets, more than all other ornithologists put together. His banding revealed that bald eagles are migrating birds, an important change in eagle knowledge.

Broley also charged that many eagles had been made sterile by pesticides, and research into what Broley started is still going on today.

In 1960, in the year after Broley's death,



the Audubon Society began its continental Bald Eagle Project, to continue Broley's work. It's a cooperative project, involving the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the U.S. Forest Service, and the various state game and fish commissions. The current research director is Alexander Sprunt, IV, and Sandy Sprunt knows the battle to save the Bald Eagle is not yet won.

Mr. ALEXANDER SPRUNT, IV. Originally, bald eagles occurred pretty much all over the North American Continent, north of Mexico. Unfortunately, this is not the case today. I might say that the most healthy eagle population that we have in North America is located from here northwestward through the coast of British Columbia, Southeastern Alaska, and out the Aleutian chain. This is a very healthy eagle population which, as far as we can tell, is living under almost primeval conditions.

I wish we could say the same about most of the eagles in the rest of the United States, but unfortunately we cannot. In the yellow areas, which cover quite a bit of territory, the eagle population is undergoing a slow decline. This decline is about on the order of that which has been going on for many, many years in the United States ever since the white man reached our shores and began to fill up the environment; and this decline would parallel that of many species of wildlife which have taken the same road.

Now the red areas, which are largely coastal and around the Great Lakes, present a different picture altogether. In these areas, there has been a catastrophic decline in the last twenty years, primarily since World War II. It is here that the reproduction of eagles has dropped sharply, and the population is undergoing a rapid decline. Just as an example, in this little section of the west coast of Florida here, where Broley did his work, and where the decline of eagles was spectacular, the rise in the human population during the same period that Broley was working was approximately 300 per cent. This is based on the 1960 population figures, and it is undoubtedly greater than that today.

Direct shooting also has been a factor in the decline of eagles. Although it has been against the law to shoot bald eagles—against federal law, in the United States, to shoot bald eagles, since 1940, shooting still is a factor. Most eagles are killed during the first four years of their lives, when they are in an all-brown plumage—that is, they lack the white head and tail of the adult bird.

During the time they are in this plumage, many people do not recognize that they are eagles. They shoot them because they think they're large hawks, or vultures. Of course, in many states—in most states, really, the shooting of large hawks and vultures is also illegal, but this doesn't stop the trophy hunter and the careless shooter from killing eagles and all other large birds as prey.

So, in this immature plumage particularly, the eagles are still being lost to the gun.

Mr. DODD. The young eagle trying his wings for the first time is symbolic of the current efforts in the United States toward the preservation of our endangered species of wildlife. We are only trying our wings. We are not yet flying. There is much we do not know about the animals, birds and fishes now in danger of extinction. We need greater research, establishment of more refuges, as well as improved position in the priority of things for the wildlife community. The United States, like any complex society, has many problems. This is one of them, this possible loss of some key members of the natural environment. It remains to be seen whether the priority assigned to this one problem will be high enough to lead to solutions.

Extinction is a harsh reality of Nature. Actually, no man knows how many species of life have been on this Earth. To say there have been millions, even billions, is prob-

ably not an exaggeration. Any life that has outgrown its environment, or has failed to adapt to changes in it, dies. It becomes extinct. The huge dinosaurs that once roamed this planet are a classic example of this truth.

Yet, extinction in the hands of Nature is a gradual and a necessary process. Extinction in the hands of Man is comparatively sudden. It is often unfeeling, almost always violent, and without question unnecessary.

That's what we've been trying to say in this hour. The preservation of the seventy-eight wildlife creatures now threatened with extinction cannot be left entirely in the hands of the scientists. There must be some conscious, positive effort by the motorist in Florida who might run down a Key Deer, by the hunter in the field who might mistake an immature Bald Eagle for another bird; by any man or company of men who might burn a forest or drain a swamp or pollute a stream. To put it another way, the time has come for the realization that man endangers an animal simply because he's there.

**ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD AT THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE POTOMAC HIGHLAND OF WEST VIRGINIA, CACAPON STATE PARK, BERKELEY SPRINGS, W. VA., OCTOBER 16, 1967**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on October 16, 1967, I addressed the third annual meeting of the Potomac Highland of West Virginia, which was held at Cacapon State Park, Berkeley Springs, W. Va. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**THE POTENTIAL OF THE POTOMAC HIGHLAND**

I am delighted to have the opportunity to address this meeting dealing with the recreational development of Eastern West Virginia.

This is a most favored area. Its potential, in my judgment, is virtually unlimited. Eastern West Virginia comes as close as any place I can think of to having almost everything it needs for full-scale recreational development.

You who are here tonight know the details concerning these assets better than I. But let me, as one who comes from another part of West Virginia, give you my impressions about this area.

These ten counties, that Potomac Highland, Inc., is promoting, have the widest range of scenic beauty in West Virginia. To say that does not disparage any other part of our state—for most all of West Virginia is richly endowed with natural beauty and resources for recreational development.

But where else can one find within a few hours driving time from Washington and other large urban centers such a contrast as that between the rolling blue grass horse country of the Eastern Panhandle and the Allegheny Mountain peaks towering nearly five thousand feet into the clouds around Spruce Knob?

It is, indeed, an area blessed—an historic section of our state, with tremendous possibilities for the future, only a few hours away from the teeming megalopolis of the Eastern Seaboard.

Yes, I think the potential is great, and I congratulate you who are attending this conference for the work you are doing and for your enthusiasm and your effective efforts to make your dreams come true.

I share those dreams. I am proud of my

state, as you are proud of it, and I like the slogan you have put on the front of your Potomac Highland brochure, "The Nation's Eastern Playground." I want to see you turn those words into the fullest reality—and I want to help you do it.

To that end, the Potomac Highlands already have much to offer the visitor. It is a truism of the travel promotion business that scenery and climate alone are not enough to hold the traveler. There must also be interesting things for the family or the couple on vacation to see and do, if they are to tarry long in one place.

At this time of year, visitors to the mountains of this area can enjoy a pageant of color that is unmatched. If they love the outdoors, as I do, they can ride, or hike the mountain trails, or hunt. In the winter they can ski. All year long they can fish.

If they enjoy "improving the breed of the horses," as the saying goes, they can visit two fine race tracks. Soon they will be able to play golf on the new championship course at Canaan Valley and enjoy other activities there at the really fabulous resort that is now in the making, and for which, I am informed, the main contracts are to be let this winter.

The visitor to the Potomac Highlands can go down into the Smoke Hole and Seneca Caverns to see the wonders of nature underground, or he can ride the Cass Railway to get the breathtaking view of the Alleghenies at Bald Knob. He can picnic, he can camp on some of the most interesting sites in the East, he can relax in wilderness areas, or in plush park facilities such as these.

He can have a farm vacation, or take a mineral bath, or go water skiing. He can come face-to-face with history at places like Harpers Ferry and Berkeley Springs.

I am happy to be able to say that I have had a part in the new developments that are under way in the Potomac Highland—developments that can mean so much to West Virginia as we look toward the future.

One of which I am particularly proud, as I am sure you are, is the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. I feel that the potential for this area is even greater than we thought at first, I say this because such areas of unspoiled natural beauty are becoming fewer and fewer in our bumper-to-bumper metropolitan world.

That portion of the Monongahela National Forest can enrich the lives of all who visit it. I believe the hundred thousand acres that Congress has set aside for the public domain will become a mecca for all who love the outdoors among the more than 30 million people who live within less than half a day's drive of it.

I think it would not be too much to say that the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation area may well become the "Wilderness Jewel" of the Eastern United States. I am extremely grateful that I had the privilege of sponsoring the legislation that created this Potomac Highland asset. I am glad to be able to report to you, too, that the observation tower on Spruce Knob, for which I was able to help secure the funds, is now nearing completion. It should be finished in November, and when it is the magnificent view from "the top of West Virginia" will become more accessible to all.

As for the "development" of the area itself, that will be up to the U.S. Forest Service, but, in contrast to highly developed or sophisticated recreation facilities, substantial portions of Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks will be left in the primitive state. The northern portion of the Smoke Hole section will be known as a "pioneer zone." This means that it will be managed so as to maintain the environment of a primitive forest similar to that found by the first pioneers when they crossed the Blue Ridge to the Alleghenies. This zone will afford a



unique opportunity for the growing number of our people who, because of the pressures of city life, want to "get away from it all."

As for the over-all potential "draw" of visitors, Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks is expected by the Forest Service to attract a million visitors a year by 1970. This, the Forest Service says, will increase to an expected three to five million by the year 2000.

Another major project of great interest to the Potomac Highland area is the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park and the National Park Service's Interpretive Facilities Center that is to be built in the coming year. This center, which will bring together the information specialists of the Park Service and allow them to work under one roof, will in itself be a tourist attraction.

A beautifully-designed, yet modern and functional, building will be erected on the hillside above the Shenandoah River near where John Brown's "fort" now stands, the historic old building that figured in the pre-Civil War raid, which is, itself a tourist attraction.

The Park Service Center, when it is completed, will house the designers, artists, and writers and so on who produce the Park Service's descriptive literature and audio-visual materials. This is a splendid new facility to come into West Virginia's Potomac Highlands and I am gratified that I had a part in obtaining it.

Each year the Park Service produces some 16 million pamphlets and other publications dealing with the National Parks, along with innumerable films, tapes and slides to help the millions who visit the parks to enjoy and appreciate them more. These aids are now produced at scattered locations throughout the country. West Virginia thus gets another welcome Federal activity that will add to the state's economic growth.

Harpers Ferry was a logical site for this new facility because of the location there of the Park Service's Stephen T. Mather Training Center, which is the principal school for training Park Service rangers in interpretive methods. The two centers will complement and supplement each other. Anticipating that the Interpretive Center—and I think correctly—will in itself draw visitors, the Park Service is providing in it an exhibit lobby where visitors to Harpers Ferry and the Historical Park can see how the Park Service explanatory material is produced. A total of \$1.2 million has been appropriated by Congress for construction of the building and equipping it.

Other current projects in this 10-county area that I think are of interest to you include the new Cranberry Mountain Information Center in Pocahontas County, the Eagle Lake Dam in the Monongahela National Forest (also in Pocahontas County), and the Trout Pond Recreation Area in Hardy County, all three of which were initiated with moneys I was able to add to the budget of the U.S. Forest Service. In addition there is the Leetown National Fish Hatchery in Jefferson County for the improvement of which I obtained funds, and the Sugar Grove Naval Radio Receiving Station in Pendleton County, for which I obtained authorization and also was able to obtain funds.

The Forest Service expects to spend \$1.7 million for the work on the Trout Pond project, of which \$675,000 has been appropriated to date. A 64-foot high dam is now under construction which will create an impoundment of about 13 acres, around which the new recreation area's camping and picnic sites will be provided. The new lake is to be known as Trout Lake.

Plans for the Eagle Lake Dam should be completed this fall. This will be a considerably larger impoundment of some 47 acres. It will eventually have 250 campsites designed to accommodate 1,300 persons at a time. There will be picnic facilities and a

beach for swimming. The estimated cost of this project is \$780,000.

About four and a half miles away is the Cranberry Mountain Visitors Information Center, which I recently had the pleasure of dedicating, bringing this project to completion. I believe that that part of the Monongahela Forest will become another mecca for visitors in the area which Potomac Highlands Inc., is promoting.

The work at Leetown is being completed and the facility will be dedicated this coming Saturday in a ceremony at which I will speak. This fish hatchery is the headquarters for one of the foremost fish disease laboratories in the world. The two new buildings include a Visitor's Center, and the expectation of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is that it will draw an increasing number of tourists.

As for Sugar Grove, the Navy is hopeful that its radio receiving center there may be operational by the end of 1968.

A basic ingredient of any tourist development, of course, is roads. Access to the recreational facilities and other attractions must be provided.

Improvement is in the making in this regard, too. Depending upon the availability of funds, the Allegheny Parkway, which I originally proposed and on which I have been working for several years, will give easy access into the heart of the Potomac Highland. It would serve the Potomac Highland area as a new north-south scenic artery, much as the Skyline Drive and Blue Ridge Parkways do along the crest of the Blue Ridge in Virginia. It would enter West Virginia about halfway between Berkeley Springs and Harpers Ferry, with a spur extending to Harpers Ferry. It would pass near Romney to a point in the vicinity of Keyser, and thence south along the high elevations of the Alleghenies, traversing the entire north-south length of the Potomac Highland area.

In my judgment this parkway could be one of the greatest boons of all to the full development of this whole region. The National Park Service is now completing its master plan for the parkway, and we should have those plans perhaps in the next few days. The field studies have been completed, the route determined, and once the plans are all wrapped up, they will be submitted to Congress. I have introduced the bill pending before the Senate Committee on the Interior that would create the parkway. The nation's fiscal picture at present, of course, is such as to make any immediate start on construction doubtful. But I hope Congress will authorize the project. It is well for us to bear in mind, however, that proposals for other scenic parkways are also before the administration and Congress. I shall continue to push as vigorously as I can to bring about the realization of this dream.

The Highland Scenic Highway, sponsored by Senator Randolph, is already under construction in its initial segments between Gorman and Richwood, and it, too, will add to the Potomac Highland potential.

It has been a pleasure for me to discuss these projects and developments with you. I commend you for the work you are doing, for it will benefit all of our state, not just the Eastern portion. But it is the Eastern portion that you are most interested in, and I say to you in closing, as I said at the outset of these remarks, that I think the potential of the beautiful Potomac Highland area is great. You have got a lot going for you. Thank you.

#### CHAMPIONSHIP NAVY BEAN SOUP

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, next Friday, as we all know, the Nation celebrates Navy Day. Aside from appropriating funds for 10 new aircraft carriers,

I can think of few ways in which the Senate could more significantly or frugally mark this auspicious occasion than by having the championship Navy bean soup included in the Senate restaurant menus that day.

In no way, of course, would this signify any disrespect for—or falling from favor of—the Senate's own famous bean soup. Without Senate bean soup to support this body during the long winter sessions, I shudder to think where the Nation might be today. But I would hope that for at least this 1 day there would be room on the menu for two bean soups.

Now, in all candor, let me add that I have never actually tried the championship Navy bean soup. One can only assume that with the entire Department of the Navy behind it, it is not going to give the Senate collective indigestion.

Mr. President, I requested and have now received from the Department a copy of the winning recipe. The fact is that despite 3 years in the Navy in World War II, I had never even heard of the Navy bean soup competition—which goes to show how uninformed one man can be. I am confident, however, that the rivalry was spirited. One pictures Navy men sending in exotic recipes from all over the world. Perhaps the finalists squared off with ladies in the Pentagon kitchen. In any case, I am sure the championship Navy bean soup is worthy of the name. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to share the Navy recipe with other Senators and their wives by having it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the recipe was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### RECIPE: NAVY BEAN SOUP

- 1 Cup Navy Beans.
- 4 Cups Water.
- 1 Pound Ham Bone, cut in sections.
- ½ Cup Onions, chopped.
- 2 Carrots, fresh, medium, sliced thin.
- 2 Ribs of Celery, fresh, chopped.
- ½ Teaspoon Prepared Mustard.
- ½ Cup Green Peppers, fresh, minced.
- ½ Cup Tomato Puree.
- 1 Whole Clove.
- 2 Peppercorns.

Pick over and wash beans thoroughly, soak for 12 hours. Drain, place all ingredients in container. Season with salt and pepper to taste. Cook slowly over low flame approximately 4 hours, stirring occasionally to keep from scorching; add liquid if necessary. Remove ham bones, serve with a sprig of parsley and crisp saltines.

Smooth Sailing.

#### A SERGEANT VIEWS THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, the Powell Tribune, a semiweekly newspaper in Park County, Wyo., has been carrying a lively exchange of views on the subject of the war in Vietnam, giving voice to its readers in an admirable attempt to encourage public concern and public thought. Among the recent letters, and published on October 13, was one from Sgt. Richard R. Martin, of the 4th battalion, 47th Infantry, telling why he is in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that Sergeant Martin's letter to the editor of the Powell Tribune be printed in the Record.



There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**IF WE HAVE WARS WE'LL NEED MEN WITH COURAGE**

DEAR EDITOR: I have been reading the Tribune articles concerning the "Dumbell War" and as an active participant in the topic under discussion I thought I might express my views.

I am 23 years old and a 1962 graduate of PHS. I was married in November of 1965, drafted in May of 1966, and I came to Vietnam with my unit in January of 1967. I am with and always have been with Co. B, 4th Bn., 47th Inf. In effect, I'm a mud stomping, bug swatting GI who is darn proud of it! Back in training I could have given less than my best and possibly I would never be where I am now, but I don't think I would have been able to live with myself for any length of time.

Our outfit is basically a "strike force." We go places where the VC dominate and as such we see a little more of what this war is all about than most people do. We see the women and children doing what little work gets done in the fields. We notice the complete absence of able bodied men and women in the many typically poor villages. We are appalled at the lack of decent food and clothing for the vast majority of the people.

We take Vietnamese interpreters with our company to talk for us when we enter the villages and "homes" of the pillaged Delta. They tell us the old farmer in Long An Province is glad to see us. He says the V.C. have slacked off considerably since Allied Forces started routing them out in early 1966. They still come through his area and demand meals, but they no longer haul off his rice in large bagfuls. The old farmer offered us a few scrounged citrus fruits. The interpreter said the old man wished he had more to offer, but long ago the V.C. took away the able bodied workers and it was hard for him to produce more.

The interpreters also tell us that the husbands and fathers of the lonely women and love starved children are away fighting in the war. Naturally they all say they are on the allied side. Some are without a doubt fighting for the V.C. That doesn't keep the women and children from being lonely and without love.

As we see villagers and workers it is part of our job to check their papers and billfolds for proper ID cards. We also check all enemy papers and billfolds. The only person I have ever known to have over 500 piasters (\$5 U.S.) in his possession was a man who was traveling with a squad of armed V.C. In his papers we found enough piasters to equal well over \$150 U.S. He also had papers indicating he had been out collecting "taxes."

The only religious building I have ever seen that was in useable condition was in a particularly heavily populated area. It was a Buddhist temple and it had five elderly Monks in it. The temple also housed the only school I have seen in my eight months over here.

Now, some of you reading this letter are saying that these problems could be resolved by pulling the U.S. troops out of Vietnam and in effect ending the war. Do you really believe the communists will open schools? After all, an ignorant person is easier to control, and how much intelligence does it take to follow a water buffalo and a plow through a rice paddy? And after the rice is harvested do you really believe they will let the ignorant farmers keep it when Red China is starving? Of course, if the war was over they would let many of the people go home, but they would keep many more people in the military for "necessary" projects. They would have to keep a strong army in case the "US Imperialists" ever struck again. Also, people will be needed to go into other countries and con-

vince them of the right (and mighty) ways of communism.

If we were to pull out of Vietnam what would become of Thailand and other small, gallant nations of Southeast Asia? As far as that goes, how long would it be before the "Red Tide" engulfed North America in its subtle but sure ways?

I realize this letter may not encompass the deeper and more controversial aspects of this war, but it basically states the reason why I (and hundreds of others) are risking life and limb in this "Dumbell War." We are doing it so that we can live with our families in a free society and so that we can help others live under conditions resembling ours as much as possible.

I respect the thoughts of the people who wrote the previous articles, even though I cannot agree with them. From the appearance of the news we get from the states many of the people that use freedom of speech to any extent are developing thoughts more and more along this line. I only hope enough people stay alert enough to insure that this type of free speech does not lull the nation so far that it brings an end to our freedom of speech.

In conclusion, I would like to borrow a part of Mr. Wickstrom's letter to the Tribune where he wrote "We hope soon there will be no Powell boys, Wyoming boys, or any other kind of boys fighting wars like this." I hope so too, but as long as there are wars like this to fight, I hope there will always be men with courage and conviction enough to fight them.

Sincerely yours,

Sgt. RICHARD R. MARTIN.

**WILDERNESS AREAS IN THE NATIONAL PARKS**

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Moab, Utah, Times Independent of October 12 has published a lead editorial entitled "Why All the Fuss?" The editorial comments that the National Park Service is presently considering areas within the national parks and monuments that might be set aside as wilderness and points out that it is completely illogical to go through this practice.

I agree wholeheartedly with the viewpoint of the editorial.

Since its creation, the National Park Service has been entrusted with the management and preservation of the scenic wonders in our national parks and monuments, and I believe it has done a very fine job. Why must we now have the Service set aside parts of the areas as wilderness within the national parks?

The policy to date has always been to preserve areas of wilderness in the parks, and there is no reason to believe that that objective will change with the change of administrations or for any other cause. I think it peculiar that we should tell the Park Service to tie its own hands so far as future planning and management are concerned. I recognize, of course, that the wilderness bill calls for a procedure of this sort, but I would hope that we will not have great areas of our parks frozen in the wilderness and therefore unavailable for consideration by the planning staff of the Park Service at a later date.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**WHY ALL THE FUSS?**

We are sure that given time, we will be able to find adequate rationalization in the well-prepared folder submitted this week, to justify the trouble and expense now being put forth, to place certain land within the present boundaries of some Utah parks and monuments (including Arches), into the wilderness category.

The withdrawal from an already-withdrawn federal preserve doesn't make much sense to us. It would appear that Park Service planners and wilderness advocates don't trust themselves in future years when it comes to further development work. So to insure perpetuity of wilderness status, a formal super-withdrawal is now being sought.

We are sure that to primarily eastern advocates of the wilderness concept, the idea is more appealing than it is to those of us who have had more than our share of near-wilderness and lack of development over the years.

But to force even the conservation-conscious National Park Service to conform in certain areas to pure wilderness preservation, when they alone have carried the preservation ball for so many years, seems to be going from the sublime to the ridiculous.

We doubt that there will be much reaction to the public hearing scheduled in Moab in December. NPS has just about developed Arches all it intends to develop it, and with respect to the rest of the monument, who cares? For all practical purpose, it is, and will be, kept in a wilderness state—regardless of the outcome of the present efforts.

**NATIONAL VFW OPPOSES WARTIME TRADE WITH COMMUNIST RUSSIA**

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I placed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the national convention of the American Legion opposing President Johnson's policy of expanding trade with Communist-bloc nations which are supplying North Vietnam with its warmaking weapons.

It has now been brought to my attention that another great veterans' organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at their annual convention in New Orleans last August, adopted a similar resolution. I believe that the VFW resolution hits the nail right on the head in its discussion of what is a strategic item when we are dealing with Communist countries.

I also invite to the attention of the Senate the emphasis placed on the conversion of the moneys derived from these imports into the "munitions, trucks, and weapons that are being sent to North Vietnam to be used against the U.S. Armed Forces and their allies fighting for freedom in Vietnam."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**RESOLUTION 264 OPPOSING ALL FORMS OF TRADE, COMMERCE, AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNIST OR COMMUNIST-CONTROLLED NATIONS**

Whereas, any aid to a Communist country, be it nonstrategic or wheat or a "loan" of American dollars, strengthens the Communist masters and further enslaves the peoples of these countries; and

Whereas, monies derived from these various imports are being converted into muni-



tions, trucks and weapons that are being sent to North Vietnam to be used against the United States Armed Forces and their Allies fighting for Freedom in Vietnam; and

Whereas, in paragraph 7, of Resolution No. 14 (1966 Convention) entitled "Resisting Communism and Assisting Our Loyal Allies in Restoring Freedom" it reads: "Oppose all forms of trade, commerce, and financial assistance that will strengthen the Communist nations, thus adhering to a policy of not strengthening the forces of Communism which have as their prime objective destruction of the United States and freedom throughout the world." This Resolution being unanimously passed by the Delegates in session at the 67th National Convention in New York; and

Whereas, in a news release dated Thursday, December 22, 1966, Commander-in-Chief Fry commends Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ill.) for his amendment in opposition of Sale of Surplus Food to Communist Nations, and in the third paragraph says "This is bad enough (referring to 4-million dollars in credit subsidies) but Yugoslavia and other Communist nations are continually trading with Communist aggressors of North Vietnam. Their goods and materials are aiding in the death of American fighting men every day."; and

Whereas, Commander-in-Chief Fry in the last paragraph of his news release of December 22, 1966 says "We must not allow food,

clothing, fuel and arms to be put into the hands of the aggressors like North Vietnam so they might drag that war for Freedom to eternity. The sooner our government stands straighter and stops listening to those who supposedly 'build bridges' with our enemies, the sooner our men can come home where they belong."; now therefore

Be it resolved, by the 68th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that we emphatically go on record demanding that the importing of Communist products be stopped immediately; and that a campaign be begun by every post, county council, district and department urging their families, friends and the citizens of their respective communities to cease purchasing these Communist imports.

Adopted at the 68th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at New Orleans, La., August 20 through 25, 1967.

### CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the September 1967 crime report for the District of Columbia as

prepared by the Metropolitan Police Department.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

#### CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SEPTEMBER 1967

During September 1967, a total of 3,393 Crime Index Offenses were reported in the District, an increase of 565 offenses or 20.0% from September 1966.

During the month increases occurred in the classifications of Homicide, up 4 offenses or 57.1%; Rape, up 11 offenses or 157.1%; Robbery, up 118 offenses or 32.8%; Housebreaking, up 214 offenses or 21.8%; Larceny (\$50 & Over), up 139 offenses or 27.4%; and Auto Theft, up 101 offenses or 15.6%.

A decrease occurred in the classification of Aggravated Assault, down 22 offenses or 6.9%.

The increases for this month brought the trend of Crime Index Offenses (total offenses for the past twelve months) to 36,497, an increase of 9,239 offenses or 33.9% from the trend of September 1966, and an increase of 269.8% from the low point of April 1957.

Clearance of Crime Index Offenses for the twelve month period ending with September 1967, were down to 25.0% as compared with 27.7% for the twelve month period ending with September 1966.

#### GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT CRIME INDEX OFFENSES, SEPTEMBER 1967

Classification	September		Change		Cumulative to date		Percent change	Total, 12 months ending September 1967
	1966	1967	Amount	Percent	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968		
Criminal homicide.....	7	11	+4	+57.1	33	40	+21.2	164
Rape.....	7	18	+11	+157.1	37	46	+24.3	159
Robbery.....	360	478	+118	+32.8	1,018	1,425	+40.0	5310
Aggravated assault.....	317	295	-22	-6.9	947	891	-5.9	3181
Burglary.....	981	1,195	+214	+21.8	2,860	3,468	+21.2	13,397
Larceny (\$50 and over).....	507	646	+139	+27.4	1,419	1,811	+27.6	6,320
Auto theft.....	649	750	+101	+15.6	1,960	2,310	+17.9	7,944
Total.....	2,828	3,393	+565	+20.0	8,274	9,991	+20.7	36,475

Precinct	September		Change		Precinct	September		Change	
	1966	1967	Amount	Percent		1966	1967	Amount	Percent
1.....	247	221	-26	-10.5	10.....	326	410	+84	+25.8
2.....	263	351	+88	+33.5	11.....	253	439	+186	+73.5
3.....	275	316	+41	+14.9	12.....	170	147	-23	-13.5
4.....	57	63	+6	+10.5	13.....	314	332	+18	+5.7
5.....	205	165	-40	-19.5	14.....	181	260	+79	+43.6
6.....	126	155	+29	+23.0	Harbor.....				
7.....	49	81	+32	+65.3	Total.....	2,828	3,393	+565	+20.0
8.....	59	94	+35	+59.3					
9.....	303	359	+56	+18.5					

Precinct	Total	Criminal homicide	Rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Housebreaking	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
1.....	221	1		51	14	36	78	41
2.....	351	1	2	84	48	92	62	62
3.....	316		1	25	8	94	150	38
4.....	63			5	3	26	17	12
5.....	165	1		31	22	63	17	31
6.....	155		3	14	5	75	20	38
7.....	81			4	3	29	31	14
8.....	94			7	1	37	36	13
9.....	359	3	2	55	42	162	33	62
10.....	410		3	60	53	140	53	101
11.....	439		5	66	25	153	48	142
12.....	147	2		9	14	55	28	39
13.....	332	3		44	43	128	56	58
14.....	260		2	23	14	105	17	99
Harbor precinct.....								
Total.....	3,393	11	18	478	295	1,195	646	750

#### DISTRICTING CONFERENCE REPORT SHOULD BE OPPOSED

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, yesterday in a speech on the Senate floor I outlined eight objections to the report of the Senate-House conference on con-

gressional redistricting which was filed in the House yesterday.

Today the Washington Post, in an excellent editorial, urges the defeat of the conference report.

While there are several objections to

the report, I think that two major considerations deserve the main attention in the Senate's vote on whether to accept the conference report.

First, the legislation proposed by the report is unconstitutional. By providing

that no States shall be required to redistrict unless a special Federal census is provided by the State, the conference is permitting States unconstitutionally to withdraw from the court's jurisdiction over redistricting.

Or if the legislation is read to authorize the courts to order a State, first, to pay for a State census, and second, to redistrict, the courts will hold the legislation to be a delaying tactic that unconstitutionally slows down the process of redistricting. I do not expect a Supreme Court which has presided over the fair redistricting of 33 States since its landmark decision in *Westberry* against Sanders only 2½ years ago to permit this conference-proposed legislation to completely halt redistricting for 5 years.

The second major point of discussion should be this: If the special census provision is ruled unconstitutional—and I am convinced it will be—the prohibition of at-large elections for Representatives contained in the conference proposal also will be unconstitutional. There is no severability clause.

Thus, there is a good possibility that many of the 164 Representatives from California, New Jersey, Indiana, Texas, Missouri, Ohio, New York, and Florida will be forced to run at large in the 1968 elections. That is so because it may be the spring of 1968 before the Supreme Court could announce a definitive decision on the constitutionality of the legislation. At that late date, Federal courts in States having unconstitutional districtings might be required to dispose of pending cases by requiring the House Members to run at large.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in this morning's Washington Post be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### DISTRICTING FIASCO

The conferees' report on the districting bill is a severe disappointment. Congress set out to create new standards that all the states would have to meet so as to assure fair and equal representation in the House. Bills for this purpose cleared both houses, and the Senate bill was admirable. But the quarrelsome conferees have ripped both bills to pieces and brought forth a substitute that is virtually worthless.

The heart of both bills was a provision requiring the states to permit no more than 10 per cent variation between their largest and smallest districts after the 1970 census. This has been completely deleted. Indeed, the conferees abandoned all efforts to set up permanent districting standards for the states because they could not agree upon an anti-gerrymandering provision and a temporary population variation rule for the next two elections. The result is to scuttle a vital principle that had been strongly approved by both houses.

What remains is merely a ban on court-imposed elections at large and a shabby declaration that no state will be required to redistrict before the 1970 census unless the results of a special census are available. It is easy to understand the lack of enthusiasm for any major redistricting drive on the basis of 1960 census figures, which are no longer an accurate measure of population in any state. If this attempt to suspend the districting process temporarily had been coupled with a strong set of standards to take hold after 1970 it would have won substantial sym-

pathy. But in its present form it is merely a pesky bit of obstructionism.

The best course for both the Senate and the House, in our view, would be to reject the conference report and to instruct the conferees to bring in a bill embracing at least the standards approved by both houses. These conferees have shamefully disregarded the will of their parent bodies, and they should not be permitted to get away with it.

#### EFFECT OF MARIHUANA ON THE HUMAN SYSTEM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a most unfortunate and ill-considered statement has been made by Dr. James L. Goddard, Commissioner of the Federal Food and Drug Administration, about the use of marihuana and its effect on the human system.

I am sure that if he had it to do again, Dr. Goddard would temper his remarks in light of the body of scientific evidence, pro and con, that exists on this subject.

It is not my purpose to reprimand Dr. Goddard, who sits in judgment on the regulation of the use and labeling of all types of drugs in the United States, and who generally has the reputation of being far stricter in his application of the laws and regulations to unusual drugs than he was in his own comments on the use of marihuana.

I do want to point out that a great number of people who are experts in the science of drugs and law enforcement do not share his liberal views on marihuana.

I wish to point out first that scientists of the caliber of Dr. Dana L. Farnsworth, director of Harvard University Department of Health Services; and Dr. Curtis Prout, chief of medicine at Harvard, made a significant statement about the marihuana problem in the *Bulletin of the San Francisco Medical Society*, and this statement was placed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* on October 11, 1967, just a few days before Dr. Goddard spoke, by the Honorable JERRY L. PETTIS, a Member of the House of Representatives from California.

Dr. Farnsworth and Dr. Prout declare in the statement that marihuana has a chemical effect on ordinary consciousness causing ideas to come forth in a "rapid, disconnected, and uncontrollable manner." They said dangerous effects include a slowing of reflexes, a distortion of reality, including loss of the sense of time, and conditions causing automobile accidents.

It is most unfortunate and discouraging to law-enforcement agencies throughout the Nation that so high an official as Dr. Goddard should make the comments he did. At the very time he was speaking, in fact, State and local law-enforcement personnel from across the Nation were gathering in Washington for a special school conducted by the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control of the Food and Drug Administration on the subject of the enforcement of our narcotics laws, including the law making it a crime to possess or use marihuana. Two very fine officers from the Nebraska State Safety Patrol who specialize in this type of law enforcement are attending this school—Sgt. Wayne Rowe and Investigator James Dibbert. They have obtained for me a copy of a resolution adopted

recently by the International Criminal Police Organization, commonly known as Interpol, representing 100 member countries.

In view of Dr. Goddard's statement that there is nothing wrong with marihuana except that there is a law against it, and that except for the law against it he would not object to his college daughter smoking marihuana any more than he would object to her drinking a cocktail, I think it is urgent to point out and to place in the *RECORD* the resolution adopted by Interpol in Japan earlier this month.

It appears that the resolution was based on conclusions of the finest scientific minds of the world on drug abuse and dependence-producing drugs. I refer to the World Health Organization and its expert committee, which has determined that cannabis, the dried flowering spikes of the pistillate plants of the hemp contained in marihuana, is capable of producing drug dependence.

Quite obviously, Dr. Goddard, who personally has the responsibility of protecting the health and welfare of our citizens, is misinformed or not completely informed about a subject which could have far-reaching damage to susceptible individuals and to our society.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* the resolution of the International Criminal Police Organization on this subject.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION 1: NARCOTIC DRUGS

(International Criminal Police Organization, 36th general assembly session, Kyoto, September 27 to October 4, 1967)

Whereas the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1953, obligates signatories to place cannabis under a system of rigid control;

Whereas many members of Interpol are from countries which have ratified or acceded to the Single Convention;

Whereas the WHO Expert Committee on Dependence-Producing Drugs has determined that cannabis is capable of producing drug dependence and that harm to society is caused by abuse of cannabis;

Recognizing the need for checking any possible tendency to minimize the harmful aspects of cannabis or to bring about legalization of this drug;

Recognizing that inadequate control of illicit cannabis traffic breeds drug dependence, creates enforcement problems and injures the national welfare;

Keeping in view the resolutions adopted in General Assembly sessions in Rio de Janeiro and in Berne in 1965 and 1966 respectively, and having considered the developments since then;

The I.C.P.O.-Interpol General Assembly, meeting in Kyoto from 27th September to 4th October 1967 at its 36th session:

Recommends that all Interpol members urge on their governments the necessity of providing adequate and prompt measures to ensure that illicit cannabis traffickers are severely dealt with, and that possession of cannabis be restricted to legitimate medical, scientific and industrial use.

(Adopted unanimously.)

#### MODEST MIRACLE IN BOONE COUNTY, MO.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, until a few years ago, for all people in rural areas to ever expect to have plenty of



pure, safe running water in their homes and barns was thought impractical.

Because of the low density of population and the considerable distances between farms, most people in rural areas had resigned themselves to the belief that it would cost far too much to be supplied water from a central system.

Mr. President, today every resident in Boone County, Mo., both rural and urban, has signed up for piped water to their homes and farms—and this includes some 2,700 farms in that county.

When all the systems are completed, Boone County expects to be the first rural county in the Nation to be completely served by central water systems.

How was it accomplished? It was accomplished by a combination of hard work by local people and the full cooperation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration with its rural community water and sewer facilities loan and grant program. This same program is helping to revitalize thousands of rural areas in this Nation.

The history of this modest miracle in Boone County was reported in detail by Lew Hudson in the *Worthington, Minn., Globe*, on September 29.

Because this article should serve to encourage and inform other rural residents on how to do the same thing as the residents of Boone County have done, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**PIPED-IN WATER FOR FARMS? HERE'S ONE PLAN—SYSTEM TRIED OUT IN MISSOURI—IT'S MORE EFFICIENT, SAFER, MAY COST LESS MONEY.**

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Problems urban areas are having with maintaining adequate water supplies have been the subject of much attention in recent years. Equally as important, but perhaps not as well known, are the problems farm people have with water systems. Today and tomorrow, the *Globe* discusses the rural aspects. This first report tells of a dramatic experiment in Boone county, Missouri while tomorrow's will discuss the extent of rural water problems in Nobles county, Minnesota.)

(By Lew Hudson)

COLUMBIA, Mo. (Special).—"Water, water everywhere but not one drop to drink."

So went the plaint of the Ancient Mariner. Around these parts, thanks to the efforts of hard working citizens, that familiar phrase has been changed about. For residents of Boone county, Missouri, it now is quite literally "water everywhere and every drop good to drink."

Boone county is the first and only county in the nation to offer every citizen, both urban and rural, with water service piped directly to their homes.

It is likely that most people have never really thought about laying water mains to farm homes, and those who have probably have considered it "totally impractical" as was the case with electrical service four decades ago.

Still, Boone county has achieved this modest miracle. Now, farmers in that area no longer have to depend on their own wells. When they want water, they do the same thing town people do—they turn the faucet on.

The county is a fairly normal one. Its farms are from small to medium size by southwest Minnesota standards. The coun-

tryside is sharply rolling with large expanses of timber on the steeper slopes and along the streams.

The Missouri river forms the southwestern border. In the center of the county is the city of Columbia, a community of more than 30,000 persons not counting the student body of the University of Missouri which has its main campus there.

Water is not a major problem here although it is sometimes costly to obtain. For livestock watering, most farmers throw a dam across a nearby ravine and build a pond. For drinking water, it is necessary to drill a well.

The area is underlaid by a deposit of coal, and wells must penetrate that to get at water which is potable.

In all, there are 2,700 farms in the county and most of the operators have signed up for piped in water. Almost all the county already has water systems in operation although laying of mains is still in progress in a few remaining sections.

Rural water systems have a long history in Missouri although it was not until the last few years that things really got moving. Back in 1935, the state legislature passed a law allowing groups of private citizens to band together to form non-profit corporations to sell water to their members. The idea at the time was to make it possible for growing suburban areas around major cities to install water systems. It was not particularly designed to be of use to strictly rural areas.

From 1935 until 1962, 12 water districts were organized around St. Louis and Kansas City. Then, in 1962 a major breakthrough came when the Federal Home Administration was authorized to help in financing of such developments.

FHA was given the power to underwrite bonds sold on the open market or to make direct loans where other financing was not available.

It was soon after that Boone county started building water mains to rural people. The first water district was formed in the fall of 1963.

A formal procedure was laid down, based upon experiences of the first district. It has since been refined.

First requirement was that a proposed water district must be laid out in order to average five users per mile of line. Anything less than this makes it unfeasible since construction costs are greater than can be paid by reasonable usage charges.

Charles Baldwin, FHA representative for the county and perhaps the key man in the entire Boone county water situation, explained the procedures to be followed.

"It all starts with an expression of local interest on the part of the citizens," he said. A mass meeting is then held to discuss the matter. If sufficient interest appears to be present, a steering committee is elected.

The test of sincere interest comes early. Each person at the mass meeting is asked to pay a \$10 fee. This is used by the steering committee to hire an engineer to make a feasibility study of the project and to draw a preliminary plan.

When this is done and if everything looks favorable, the steering committee then contacts every person within the proposed district asking them to sign a tentative agreement to hook onto the water system.

At this point, the preliminary plan is submitted to the Missouri Board of Health. The FHA then draws up a summary of the plans and submits it to the state FHA office for its approval.

When these steps have been completed, an attorney is retained to describe the legal boundaries of the proposed district and to prepare the necessary notices of hearings.

Under Missouri law, a petition, containing at least 50 signatures of land owners in the district, must be signed to call a court hear-

ing on the proposal. At this hearing, all persons are invited to testify. Baldwin says to date, in 10 district proceedings, not one objector has appeared.

Each water district is governed by a board of directors. Initially, the board is appointed by the court with each member representing a geographical portion of the district. Later, board members are elected on a staggered basis.

When court approval is received and a board appointed, the directors then go back to the people to have them sign firm user agreements. A fee of \$25 is collected at this time from each.

By this time, each prospective user has invested \$35 in the project. His first \$10 is his meter deposit. The last \$25 is used as a connection fee and helps to build the system.

Financing of the well drilling and laying of mains is accomplished by issuance of revenue bonds. These are sold after a revenue bond election is held. Final engineering plans are drawn and the district is then ready to move into construction.

FHA can loan money to districts at four per cent interest but funds available from the government are severely limited at this time. An alternative is to sell the revenue bonds on the normal bond market to private investors.

The board of directors sets the rates to be charged. Baldwin said the districts try to keep the total construction costs at about \$1,000 per connection or less. Minimum charges are set at a level high enough to meet the bond payments. Charges for consumption over the minimum bring in necessary money to keep the system in operation and to make any repairs which might be necessary.

Boone county's districts charge an average of \$6 per month as a minimum rate. This is for the first 2,500 gallons. The next 15,000 gallons is at 75 cents per thousand, and all over that at 50 cents per thousand gallons.

Districts also have a commercial rate for such things as trailer courts, manufacturing enterprises and large cattle feeders. It provides a \$12 minimum for the first 5,000 gallons with the next 15,000 gallons at 75 cents per thousand, the next 15,000 gallons at 50 cents per thousand, and all over 35,000 gallons at 35 cents per thousand.

A self reading system is used under which residents send in cards monthly with their meter readings. Once a year or so, the district sends a meter reader around to double check the accuracy of the reading.

At present, each district elects a clerk who prepares the billings. Discussions are now underway as to the possibility of setting up a central maintenance crew and billing office to serve all districts and supported by all.

The rate structure is such that virtually all farmers sign up for the service. However the prices are too high to permit irrigation use. Districts could not supply enough water for general irrigation.

The districts have found that while most farmers are happy to hook onto the system, they still depend on ponds for their livestock water supplies and use the pressure system for house use. In other areas, where farm ponds are more difficult to build, farmers might find it to their advantage to use the piped water for livestock as well as house use.

Wells supplying the districts in Boone county average 1,000 feet in depth. Mains are 160-pound per square inch plastic pipe laid 42 inches below the surface. Depending on needs, mains vary from four to six inches in diameter.

Mains go only to the property line closest to the house. Installation of connecting lines is the responsibility of the farmer.

To date, Boone county has a total investment in rural water mains and wells of more than \$6,000,000. In return, it has provided every rural citizen with a safe and ample sup-



ply of water, piped to his door at a price comparable to that paid by urban citizens. No longer is it necessary to have water hauled out from town during drought periods, to suffer the inconvenience of break-down of private pumps, or to forego the modern conveniences of automatic washers, dishwashers, or adequate plumbing.

It is an accomplishment fully as significant as the extension of electric service by the REA's of the nation. It is one sure to be emulated by other counties in years to come.

#### RE PENN-CENTRAL MERGER

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, all of us from the Northeast have been greatly heartened by the action of the U.S. district court in New York yesterday which clears the way for the consummation of the merger of the New York Central, Pennsylvania, and New Haven Railroads.

The decision was notable for its promptness and also for its clear acknowledgment of the relationship between this merger and the very survival of rail service to the New England area. The court acknowledged that even a temporary cessation of the New Haven's operations would bring "devastating hardship" to the area involved, and made it clear that, since other objections had been disposed of, the merger should proceed as fast as possible.

The district court, in fact, set a 15-day limit within which its decision could be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. As the district court noted, no one can determine whether the Supreme Court will be willing to hear an appeal on an expedited basis that would permit a decision before December 31 of this year. The processes of justice are and should be deliberate, of course, but speaking for myself and as I see the interests of New England, I can only express the hope that the very special economic circumstances in this case will be taken into consideration by the High Court should an appeal be made.

The district court itself spelled out those special circumstances in its decision yesterday as follows:

No one has contested the forecast of the New Haven Trustees that their cash will run out at the end of 1967; no one has indicated any probable source of funds for the beleaguered property other than the merged Penn-Central.

Mr. President, the U.S. district court in New York has taken a major step toward bringing this important matter to an equitable conclusion. And it has demonstrated in the process that the judicial branch does not stand blind or aloof from reality. We can only hope that any remaining issues will be dealt with as promptly and as fairly and that the Penn-Central merger may come to pass before it is too late to realize the full economic benefit that should flow from it.

#### ADMIRAL TRUE ON VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Rear Adm. Arnold E. True, USN, retired, served for many years in the U.S. Navy after his graduation from the Naval Academy until his retirement some years

ago. Since that time he has been associate professor of meteorology at San Jose State College in California, following his last naval service as chief meteorologist for the Atlantic Fleet.

During World War II Admiral True was commander of the U.S.S. *Hammond*, which played a vital role in the turning point of the Pacific war in the Battle of Midway where she was finally sunk in battle. Admiral True holds the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, Bronze Star, and other decorations.

Therefore his is a voice which deserves to be heard on the subject of Vietnam. He has taken a strong position in opposition to our policies, as have several other military figures who during their careers attained high status and now in retirement are free to speak their minds. This Admiral True has been doing in a series of speeches made in Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and other places. Recently he and I were together on a television program in Chicago.

I have received from him the text of his basic views presented in his speeches, under the title "Vietnam: Dead End in Asia." In it he examines some of the slogans and myths with which the American people have been bombarded as to our Vietnam operations. He finds that our military effort is not, in fact, achieving the goal of combating communism but rather is turning Vietnamese against us that we must "turn this country around" so that we become "leaders, not obstructionists, in an evolving world."

Mr. President, the words of Admiral True deserve heed and I hope his audiences, and those who may read his views, will listen. I ask unanimous consent that this address may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### VIETNAM: DEAD END IN ASIA

(By Rear Adm. Arnold E. True, USN, retired)

(NOTE.—The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not reflect the views of the Navy Department.)

We are here to discuss a war that our country is fighting with a small, technologically undeveloped nation in Asia 10,000 miles away. Historian Arnold Toynbee says that the destinies of the whole world are involved in Vietnam. So much of the world's attention has been focused on it, that this small nation has become the most important country in the world. There is such a divergence between public pronouncements and facts that our people are divided and confused. Alan Paton says, "Man is capable of creating tremendous noble slogans and shouting them aloud while doing ignoble deeds—and the more ignoble the deeds, the louder the slogans are shouted."

In this age of television and radio, we are bombarded with a stream of conflicting opinions, propaganda, statements, misstatements, and slogans so that it is not surprising that we are confused.

Slogans are the refuge of the unthinking. Adolph Hitler knew this when he proposed that the big lie, repeated loud enough and often enough, would be believed by the people. Sometimes the liar himself comes to believe it. I am not suggesting that we have any Adolph Hitlers in this country.

The public relations barrage that reaches

the American people runs like this: our objective in Vietnam is self-determination for the Vietnamese people. We have made sacred commitments. Our intervention is in support of the SEATO Treaty. We are supporting the free world. Our national honor is at stake. The key to our involvement is our own national security. We must stop communism. If we don't fight them there we'll have to fight them here. This war will prevent a bigger war in the future. We must support our boys in Vietnam. We are winning the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people. It is a simple case of aggression by North Vietnam against a neighboring country whose freedom we are defending. Wars of liberation must not be permitted to succeed. We will not grow tired. We will not be defeated. These are noble sounding slogans. They are designed to appeal to our best instincts and our highest moral values. They are heard so often that many Americans believe they mean what they say.

Let us examine some of the slogans and the facts or lack of facts that lie behind them:

We are most frequently told that our objective in Vietnam is "self determination" for the Vietnamese people. A careful reading of the 1954 Geneva Accords indicates that they offered exactly that. After a cooling off period for the departure of the French, a free election under supervision of the International Control Commission was to be held in 1956, to decide if South Vietnam would reunite with North Vietnam or remain an independent country. That election was never held because Ngo Dinh Diem who had been installed as premier by the United States, with our encouragement, refused to hold them. President Eisenhower said that if they had been held, 80% of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh. South Vietnam has had a series of dictatorships for thirteen years that were unpopular with the people. General Ky holds power by virtue of the support of U.S. tanks, aircraft, and troops. The recently elected general assembly consisted of a carefully screened group of mandarins and wealthy landowners who have dominated Vietnam for a thousand years. Students and Buddhists protest that the recent Presidential elections were a fraud. It has been said that the elections were very like those in the U.S., but we don't let the army vote twice and we don't prohibit all Republicans from voting. Many unbiased observers think that Ho Chi Minh would still get 80% of the votes if a truly free election were possible. Under present circumstances it is not possible. A news dispatch a few days ago reported that 240,000 leaflets were dropped on a Vietnamese village which said that the village would be bombed again and again and advised the villagers to defect to the Saigon government if they wished to live. This does not sound like self-determination.

The Administration says repetitiously that we have made commitments to the government of South Vietnam that must be kept. According to the U.S. Constitution, foreign policy shall be conducted by the executive with the advice and consent of the Senate. I can find no record of the Senate having advised or consented to any commitments to the government of South Vietnam. I do find record of their having consented to and ratified the charter of the United Nations, and our actions in Vietnam are in direct violation of that charter. It is claimed that our intervention is in support of the SEATO treaty. A group of eminent international lawyers state that it is a violation of the SEATO treaty. India, Pakistan, and Britain are members of SEATO and they are not fighting in Vietnam.

Another slogan is that we are supporting the "free world". Our "free world" has some poor examples in the military dictatorships in Greece, in Taiwan, in Haiti, and a dozen other countries, not to mention that of Gen-



eral Ky in South Vietnam. It would be a little closer to the truth to say that we are supporting any government anywhere that is anti-communist, regardless of the wishes or the freedom of the people.

It is said that our National honor is at stake. Norman Cousins in an editorial in the *Saturday Review* says, "The President is indeed right that our national honor is at stake in Vietnam. The national honor is at stake because things are being done in Vietnam that are dishonorable and inconsistent with the meaning of American history."

In a recent speech in Texas, the President said the key to our involvement in Vietnam is our own national security. He did not explain how tiny Vietnam could threaten the security of the United States. There seems to be little danger of the Vietnamese Navy capturing San Francisco or landing an invasion force. It is true that our national security is threatened but not in or by Vietnam. We are now spending more than 70 billion dollars a year for national security and supporting a military force of over 3 million men and we have less security than at any time in our history.

Another slogan is that we must stop communism. Three years ago the Defense Department reported that there were about 95,000 active communists in South Vietnam. Some authorities say that a large proportion of these were non-communist nationalists. Today the official reports indicate that about 300,000 active communists are in South Vietnam and we have killed 200,000. If we are stopping communism, how do their numbers grow at such a rate? A Vietnamese teacher watching the bombing of a Vietnamese village said "Today we make many communists". There is a way to combat communism, but it is not military. We can best defeat communism by building a better society for the people than the communists can build. We might start at home.

The Secretary of State says that we are fighting now in Vietnam to prevent a bigger war in the future. The news reports indicate that this is a good-sized war now, and it has dire prospects of growing directly into the bigger war that we are trying to prevent. Russia has promised that for every escalation by the U.S., she will increase her aid to Vietnam. That aid has been increasing. We need to remember that Russia has a more valid commitment to support North Vietnam than we have to support South Vietnam, and the probabilities are that she will keep that commitment. China has promised that she will not see Vietnam defeated. Most Chinese scholars and experts believe that China will keep that promise. We would certainly go all out if China or Russia were attacking Canada or Mexico on our borders.

Congressmen voting funds for the Vietnam war say "We must support our boys in Vietnam". I dare say that if you took a poll of the boys in Vietnam, you would find an enormous preference for being supported at home. We certainly don't support them by pushing more and more of them into the jungles and mud of a country 10,000 miles away in a war that they don't understand and for which they have little enthusiasm. If the Chinese suddenly pour a million troops into Vietnam, our boys will face a massacre far worse than Korea. Is that the support we offer?

"We must win the hearts and minds of the people". This is really a strange one. When we sacrifice our blood and our treasure to save these people from the slavery of communism and lead them to freedom and democracy, it seems that this in itself would win the hearts and minds of the people. But we have to pacify them by keeping a large part of the army in the villages to reinforce their desire for the blessings of American democracy. The only ones we don't have to pacify are those who are selling PX goods

on the black market in Saigon. Our military personnel report that the NLF soldiers and the North Vietnamese soldiers are the best fighters that they have ever seen. At the same time they report that the Saigon army is not interested in fighting—that the soldiers are unreliable—that they desert by the thousands. These Saigon soldiers are of the same blood and nationality as the NLF. What could be the explanation of this? Is it possible that the common people and the Saigon Government's soldiers do not believe in or support the government for which they are forced to fight?

"It is a simple case of aggression by North Vietnam against a neighboring country". There is no historical foundation for the statement that N. and S. Vietnam are two countries. The Geneva Accords state plainly that the 17th parallel is a temporary line made originally to separate the armies of the French and the Viet Minh. General Ky was born in Hanoi. If there are two countries, we have a paradoxical situation in that the dictator and 'elected' vice President of S. Vietnam is a foreigner from the enemy country that is doing the aggressing.

"Wars of national liberation must not be permitted to succeed". If this statement is true, the status quo is frozen in the entire world by edict from America. No peoples dissatisfied with their government, no matter how autocratic or dictatorial may be permitted to change that government. This seems inconsistent with the history of America, since our country was founded by men who fought a war of national liberation.

Today we are fighting two wars; one against Vietnam and one against poverty, hunger, despair and discrimination in the United States. One of these wars is supposed to be a limited war. Which one? Our cities are slums. Our transportation systems are obsolete. The subways of Moscow and Leningrad, the railroad trains of Japan and the streets of Paris make the U.S. look like a backward country. Our crime rate is rising. It is not safe to walk in the streets and parks at night. What are our priorities? If the peoples of a developing country look at us and read our newspapers, do they see a society that they wish to emulate? They may envy our wealth but not our sense of values.

For fifty years the American public has been brain-washed into an anti-communist paranoia. For twenty years our wealth and our energies have been poured into an armaments race with the Soviet Union under the myth of the existence of a monolithic communism. We cling to this idea in spite of the obvious changes that are taking place in the communist world. If we have any cause to fear communism, it does not lie in threats from the jungles of Vietnam. It lies in the neglect of our own society while we pour billions into the war machine.

How do we get out of the mess we are in? General Gavin, in a speech at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, in offering a solution, said "Let's turn this country around." Pursuing a wrong direction saves neither face nor dignity. The United States is without question the wealthiest and most powerful country in the world. We are rapidly becoming the most hated country in the world. We have the capacity to exercise worldwide leadership through economic and cultural achievements—not through a genocidal war against a little country in Southeast Asia.

Sometime ago, we asked the Secretary General of the United Nations to use all of his efforts to bring the Vietnam war to an end. He proposed a logical and practical course of action. We ignored it. We wanted to "win."

The Vietnam war is only one symptom of a disease in our foreign policy which may be fatal if left untreated. If we don't "turn this country around" there will be more Vietnams in Southeast Asia, in South America, and in

Africa. We are trying to stem a tide of revolution among the hungry and underprivileged peoples of the world. We are trying to maintain the status quo in a world where the fundamental law is change. It can't be done and our attempts will result in our own disintegration and destruction. The alternative is to become leaders, not obstructionists, in an evolving world.

In the last half century, the world has shrunk to a size where it can be circled in 90 minutes instead of 90 days. A narrow nationalism is as obsolete today as a narrow tribalism was a half century ago. Technology has given to us and to others the means to destroy mankind in a matter of minutes. If we want to survive we must control this technology. The only solution is an international organization to settle disputes without war. The United Nations is an attempt in this direction. It is ineffective in preventing war because it does not have the full support of the two power giants of the world—the United States and the Soviet Union. A third giant, China, is now appearing. The key to international peace lies in co-existence and cooperation among these three while a more effective international organization is being built. U Thant has said that the membership and voting weight of the present U.N. must be made more realistic before it can become a really effective organization. A logical and constructive move by the United States would be to take the lead in building the United Nations into a workable and more effective entity. If our present leaders cannot do the job, let's find some who can and will!

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 415

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modified amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 12. Section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act (30 U.S.C. 791) is



amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) The Board shall cease to exist on June 30, 1969, unless in the period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection and ending on December 31, 1968, proceedings under this Act shall have been instituted before the Board and hearings under this Act shall have been conducted by the Board. On or before January 10, 1969, the Attorney General shall determine whether such proceedings have been so instituted, and such hearings have been so conducted, within that period. The determination so made by the Attorney General shall be published in the Federal Register."

Nothing in the Act shall be construed to impair the power of Congress to provide for an instrumentality to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I want to say, with respect to this amendment that we have presented, it allows 1 year for the Board normally to operate under the 1950 act.

As everyone knows from the basic language, it depends upon the Attorney General making a finding, when he has reason to do so, with respect to a Communist-front organization or any other alleged tainted organization, then to file a petition and serve it on such organization and also serve it on the Board, and the Board then can institute hearings and summon witnesses.

Incidentally, under the rest of the language of the amendment that is offered to the 1950 act, the Board could enter an order but it does not call for compulsory self-registration which the Court found to be in violation of the fifth amendment.

I do not quarrel with the decision of the Court in that respect. The act had to be cured, as was suggested in the amendment that was offered in the first instance. Here, however, under this additional language, there will be 1 year; and, obviously, if nothing happened, I cannot imagine that either Congress or the Board would want to sustain a board for a considerable period of time without any functions and in the meanwhile drawing pay.

I have discussed this with one member of the Board certainly, and he agrees with that concept.

Now there is, in addition, one sentence to the effect that nothing in the amendment shall impair or interdict the right of Congress to create an instrumentality to carry out the objectives and purposes of the 1950 act.

I asked the majority leader to concur in that language for a reason. Actually, it is not necessary, but I would not want someone, at some future day, to charge that we were acting in bad faith and that we had virtually—implicitly or otherwise—agreed that the Board, or anything like a board, should go completely out of business without having some substitute agency or instrumentality to carry out the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Therefore, under the circumstances, I think that just about concludes any controversy with respect to the pending bill.

For myself, I think that on Monday next, I shall want to make a few amplified remarks and submit a few additional things for the RECORD.

I do want to take issue with the very distinguished former Attorney General of the United States on some of his statements made on this floor.

Likewise, I want to indicate from the record how much time was actually devoted to this matter before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. It will be just as well to have a complete record.

Then I want to take judicial notice of the fact that question was raised about the Attorney General not coming before the committee.

For that purpose, I shall want to submit a letter to the Attorney General by the chairman of the committee inviting him to come and appear with respect to the matter in hand.

#### SO-CALLED DEMONSTRATIONS FOR PEACE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, during the past few days we have been treated to the sickening spectacle of young men all across America, many in dirty clothing with long hair and long beards, burning their draft cards and participating in so-called demonstrations for peace. Many others, we read in the press, are preparing to "turn in their cards" and to refuse to serve their country. These disorders, we understand, are to culminate on tomorrow of this week with a massive demonstration in Washington and a march on the Pentagon designed to "shut it down."

The draft card burners and the demonstrators oppose the war in Vietnam. They have expressed the intent to create such disorders and such chaos, if they can, that the normal operations of the Department of Defense will be disrupted and the conduct of the war impeded. This, of course, they cannot do. At least, it is my belief that we have not yet reached the point at which these people will be permitted to undertake actions that could lead to any such result.

And in this connection, I wish to read a paragraph from the lead editorial in today's Washington Post:

It is a purile form of anarchy to talk about closing down the Pentagon. These marchers had better acquaint themselves with the facts of life: they are not going to be allowed to close down the Pentagon "war machine" or any other kind of United States Government machine.

This does not mean that our Nation should remain complacent in the face of threats such as the misguided and irresponsible demonstration leaders and would-be draft dodgers have made. I am not complacent, for it is my belief, based on the most reliable information that I can gather, that their objective is to create a situation, if they can, in which lawbreaking and violence will result. They cannot stop the war, but they can do, and they are doing, and they have done, and they will continue to do, untold mischief and damage to this Nation, both at home and abroad.

Mr. President, instead of bringing the peace nearer, the "peace demonstrators" are making the prolonging of the war inevitable. The immaturity and the irresponsibility of the "peaceniks" can cause the deaths of many more American boys. The blood of U.S. soldiers and sailors, of U.S. marines and airmen will be on their hands. The demonstrators for peace, Mr. President, are in reality agents of death, for they encourage our enemies to hold out against American fighting men in Vietnam in the mistaken belief that the hippies and the flower children and the draft-card burners—as well as those who encourage them—represent the real America. Thank God, they do not.

I think a review of recent events that have led up to the impending demonstration will be useful, since the plans for Saturday are an outgrowth of previous demonstrations—supported by divergent groups and persons, but all united toward the goal of creating a crisis in Government.

The apparent chief sponsor of the events which have been occurring in other places and which are to be climaxed here in the Nation's Capital is the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, formerly known as the Spring Mobilization Committee. It is described as a "coordinating group," which welcomes the affiliation of any and all organizations protesting the war and opposing U.S. policy in Southeast Asia.

Its chairman is David Dellinger, editor of a publication called Liberation, a leftist magazine published in Greenwich Village in New York. Dellinger has been widely identified with the radical left. In one of the earliest statements announcing the plans for the march here, he was quoted as saying:

We do not intend to express the kind of dissent that can be ignored.

The aim of the demonstration is to "obstruct the war machine," and he said that those who take part are prepared to be arrested—New York Times, August 18, 1967.

Dellinger was further quoted the next day, August 19, as saying that the demonstration may involve "new techniques" of civil disobedience, but he declined to say what they would be—UPI, Washington Post, August 19, 1967.

A second individual, described as "coordinator" for the demonstration, is Jerry Rubin, whom the Washington Evening Star on September 27 described as "a 29-year-old confirmed radical," the organizer of the Vietnam Day Committee on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. Rubin was quoted by the Star on that date as saying:

Mass civil disobedience will send the message across the country.

Rubin was born in Cincinnati in July 1938. In 1964 he traveled to Havana, Cuba, under sponsorship of the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba, in open defiance of the State Department's ban on Cuban travel. He has been active in anti-Vietnam movements and, in June 1965, reportedly said:

We must consider treason—deliberate sabotage of the war machine.

He openly describes himself as a "rev-



olutionary," and last summer, after making an uninvited appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in which he wore a Revolutionary War uniform, he was fined \$45 for disorderly conduct. He was quoted in the Washington Star article as saying:

If white America wakes up, it won't be because of conscience, but because they're afraid the whole house is going to come down.

David Dellinger, to go back to him for a moment, was born in Wakefield, Mass., August 15, 1915. He has been prominently associated with the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist group. He has expressed approval of the Castro regime in Cuba and sympathy for the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico.

In other statements to the press, Rubin has stated:

The peace movement is no longer one of merely protest and demonstration. We are now in the business of wholesale and widespread resistance and dislocation of the American society.

We, the American people, are going to have to close down the Pentagon, the universities, the banks—all the institutions that use and destroy human beings and values.

I pause here, Mr. President, only long enough to say that that is revolution, pure and simple.

Mr. President, the genesis of the demonstration planned for Saturday occurred last May 20 and 21, when the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam held an antiwar rally and conference here in Washington at the Hawthorne School. The stated purpose of the conference was threefold: First, an evaluation of the April 15, 1967, demonstrations in New York City and San Francisco; second, coordination of various aspects of the so-called peace movement; and third, the exchange of ideas on future programs. Several workshops were set up, and the workshop on mass demonstrations brought in a recommendation for staging a massive demonstration in the form of a march on Washington, which is planned for tomorrow. Reportedly the national public relations director of the Communist Party, USA, Arnold Johnson, was one of the persons attending the conference and approving the recommendation for Saturday's demonstration.

The conference, which was attended by some 700 individuals, included other Communist Party members, for example, James Jackson, Archie Brown, and Bettina Aptheker, all members of the Communist Party National Committee.

Also present were members of the Socialist Workers Party and its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance. Peace groups attending included the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Women's Strike for Peace, and the Committee for Nonviolent Action. After the May meeting, the committee changed its name to the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, or NMCEWV.

On August 29, 1967, a rally attended by approximately 2,000 to 3,000 persons was held by the NMCEWV and other anti-Vietnam war organizations in New York City. H. Rap Brown, leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Com-

mittee, SNCC, was one of the speakers. He reportedly told the rally:

We helped build this country, and we will burn it down.

He called President Johnson "Hitler's illegitimate son and a gangster." Among other individuals on the speakers' platform were Henry Winston, national chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and other Communist Party members.

At a news conference held on August 29, the Reverend Thomas Lee Hayes, the executive director of the Episcopal Peace Fellowship, and a spokesman for NMCEWV, stated that demonstrators were then expected to come here from across the Nation for a confrontation that would "shut down the Pentagon." He said:

We will fill the hallways and block the entrances and thousands of people will disrupt the American war machine.

H. Rap Brown also attended that press conference. He announced that SNCC would support the demonstration in Washington, and said that he himself would attend it.

During the period August 31–September 4, 1967, the National Conference for New Politics convention was held in Chicago. There, a resolution was unanimously accepted endorsing the confrontation with "the warmakers in Washington, D.C." The resolution urged all groups represented at the convention to participate in the demonstration.

Concurrent with these developments, as one considers the background for this week's events, groups throughout the country held meetings to publicize the plans for the march and the demonstration. These included the Student Mobilization Committee in Philadelphia, a group reportedly controlled by Young Socialist Alliance members.

Others were the Minnesota Committee To End the War in Vietnam, which recently held a meeting in Minneapolis to mobilize for the demonstration. Other groups, including the Communist Party, were requested to join with the Minnesota Committee in supporting the demonstration.

In Cleveland, the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council issued a letter urging participation in the Washington march to "involve thousands of persons across the country in a massive display of determination through forms of protest and direct action."

The 1967 National Convention of the Students for a Democratic Society has urged its chapters to support the demonstration, which was reportedly announced as the culmination of various local antiwar projects during the summer and fall. The Hartford, Conn., chapter of SDS reportedly has made great efforts toward bringing people here tomorrow.

In addition to the groups I have already cited as supporting the march, the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, cited as a Communist front, has also reportedly chartered two buses to leave New York City for Washington. In all, I understand that transportation has been arranged—as of the latest date for

which I was able to obtain information—for 49,700 persons. There may be reason to doubt that that many persons will take part; on the other hand, it is possible that more may take part.

The demonstration is not a spontaneous one. It has an international aspect, too. Plans have been announced by various groups that concurrent with the demonstration here in the District of Columbia, other demonstrations will be held in Copenhagen, Edinburgh, Paris, Rome, London, and some Canadian cities.

In this connection, the arrival in Washington of a "peace torch" is planned as a part of the demonstration. This torch was ignited in Japan, carried to San Francisco and is now being carried through various cities in the United States. The torch is said to be symbolic of opposition to American policy in Vietnam. It is being transported in a Volkswagen bus.

Mr. President, I have stated several times in recent weeks in this Chamber that it is my belief that there is a concerted effort on the part of radical individuals and groups to create a crisis in our American Government. This is true in the fields of welfare and civil rights, and I believe it includes the Vietnam war as well. The tactics in all the demonstrations are similar, and the participants are often the same.

My belief that there is a pattern in these occurrences, that they are part of an overall plan of provocation, is borne out and strengthened by statements that have been called to my attention in the October 14 edition of Washington's so-called underground newspaper, the Washington Free Press.

On page 3, in this underground newspaper, in an article headlined "Anti-War Escalation," the paper reported in connection with the march on Washington:

The opening round was fired on Sept. 11 when 5 young people showered the Senate with leaflets. "To all U.S. Congressmen," the leaflets read, "Your first order of business this session should be a general declaration of peace, followed by immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, an end to conscription, and an end to the suppression of Black Americans. Until you meet these emergencies there will be sustained disruptions of the government apparatus."

The Selective Service, this underground newspaper, the Washington Free Press, continued, was the next target, beginning on September 14, with the demonstration by the Woman's Strike for Peace following on September 20.

Furthermore, the paper said on page 4, in connection with the events of this so-called antidraft week:

October 16 is regarded as a beginning, not an ending. . . . It is the offspring of the April 15 draft card burning in New York. Should the non-cooperators be indicted for violation of the Military Selective Service Act or called for induction, their cases will provide . . . a rallying point for other young men who are being urged to take part in the resistance.

Our job—

The paper said in still another article on page 5 under a headline so obscene that I will not repeat it on the Senate floor—  
is to demoralize the army.



Mr. President, it has been stated by those planning Saturday's demonstration that it will be peaceful and non-violent. Perhaps it will be, I hope that it will be. We have had enough of riots and unrest and bloodshed and violence.

But, Mr. President, I am also very reliably told that those who are planning this march and this demonstration reject the view that their aims—whatever they may be—can be achieved peacefully or without violence. That is why I said at the outset of my remarks that it is my belief, based on the most reliable information that I can gather, that the objective is to create a situation in which law-breaking becomes inevitable and in which violence and arrests and a display of military power will occur.

What, may I ask, is "civil disobedience" but the breaking of the law? That is what we are promised for tomorrow, Saturday—civil disobedience. The viewpoint of the agitators, if I have gaged it correctly, is that only by civil disobedience, only by breaking the laws and creating incidents, can they get the attention they want.

We have had criticism of the war in Vietnam aplenty right here in this Chamber—most of it reasonable, intelligent, responsible dissent. That is the democratic way. But it is not enough for the irresponsible, the beatniks, the fellow travelers, the revolutionaries, the Communists, the anarchists, who apparently will not be satisfied until blood runs in the streets.

Mr. President, I do not know what will happen Saturday. But I want to commend the various agencies of Government that have been preparing for any eventuality. In this connection, the Washington Post editorial this morning to which I have already referred said:

The Government has manifested, as it should, genuine tolerance for, if not hostility to, a demonstration against itself; and the General Counsel of the General Services Administration, Mr. Harry R. Van Cleve Jr., has accorded full recognition to the civil liberties issues involved.

So I commend these people in the Government and the agencies that have been preparing for any eventuality and that have been discussing with the purported leaders of the march concerning the planning of the march, attempting, as best these Government leaders can, to keep the march and the demonstration within controllable bounds. Many agencies are involved—the General Services Administration, the National Park Service, the Justice Department and the FBI, the Selective Service, the Department of Defense, the Metropolitan Police, the Arlington County police, and others.

Representatives of these agencies and groups have attempted to draw up ground rules and an agreement with the leaders of the demonstration to insure that it will be peaceful and that violence will not occur. I hope that sensible rules will prevail. The representatives of Government have bent over backward in their efforts to guarantee that the rights of peaceable assembly and free speech are not abridged. There has been the greatest regard for constitutional rights—even for those who do not reciprocate with the

same sense of responsibility regarding their own actions.

In this respect the Washington Post editorial of this morning states:

Not all of the March leaders have responded in kind. These leaders are diverse in background, interest and aim. Their organization appears unstructured. And while some have been genuinely concerned to keep the protest peaceable, others have talked quite irresponsibly about civil disobedience and even violence.

The officials of Government have shown great restraint in dealing with the threat this demonstration poses.

In the case of the draft card burners, I think far too much restraint has been shown. It is true that litigation is now pending in the courts regarding the legality or illegality of such acts. But the Selective Service Act requires that a man in draft status have his card in his possession at all times, and it would seem that the destruction of the card would be prima facie evidence of violation of the law—to say nothing of the insult to flag and country that is so repugnant to all who love this land. I think that far too much leniency has been accorded, and that a crackdown at the outset would have spared us much of the shame that we all must feel at the actions of those who hold their country and their Government in such low esteem.

Mr. President, I hope that all who are curiosity seekers or thrill seekers, that all who have no business in the area of the demonstration on Saturday, will be urged by responsible authorities to stay away from the scene—and that, if it is possible, the police keep the tourists and the merely curious and the passersby away from the area. I say this in the interest of preserving the peace and for the safety of the public in general.

What we have witnessed this week and what we will yet witness is a sign of the times—another manifestation of the breakdown of respect for authority, for government, for religion, for morality, and for country. These virtues are not as old fashioned or as out of date as some in this day profess to believe.

The demonstrators tomorrow, whether it is their aim or not, will be serving the cause of America's enemies. If the demonstrators do not know this, they are incredibly naive or unbelievably stupid. I believe that many or most of them are not only fully aware of this but are also intent upon serving such cause.

Mr. President, the evidence suggests that, if the Communists have not actually organized this demonstration, they are taking full advantage of it. It is an effort to stimulate confusion and division among our own citizens. In my opinion, it is an effort calculated to demean the President of the United States and the Presidency, an effort designed to weaken this country's position throughout the world, and especially in Vietnam, because it is indubitably the hope of the Communists in our own country and elsewhere that the resolution of the American people will be eroded and that the history of the French failure will be repeated by an American failure and that the war will be lost at home.

The most despicable aspect of all, to

me, is the below-the-belt blow it deals our men in uniform in Southeast Asia. They have, time and time again, displayed courage above and beyond the call of duty in their fight against the Communists. They have withstood the best the Communists can throw at them militarily. But, Mr. President, against the insidious tactics of the so-called peace demonstrators, which sap the morale of our fighting men and undermine them at home, Americans in Vietnam are defenseless. The aid and comfort given to our enemies by the demonstrators can only mean that the war will be prolonged and that the casualty list of American boys will grow.

Mr. President, before I conclude these remarks, I want to make it unmistakably clear that my words here are aimed at the irresponsible demonstrators and draft card burners and the Communist-inspired leaders who manipulate them. Nothing that I have said is intended to reflect in any way on the sincerity and the integrity of responsible critics of the conduct of the war in Vietnam, especially those in this Chamber, among whom may be counted some of the most highly regarded, highly respected Members of this body.

As I have said so many times in this Chamber, the rights of constructive and responsible dissent, of legitimate free speech and free assembly in the United States of America, are unquestioned. But draft card burnings and attempts to impede and harass the operations of Government and to intimidate its officials are distortions of those principles—distortions that have already been tolerated far too long. I hope that reasonable minds will prevail and that the wishes of those individuals and groups who may try to incite violence will be thwarted this weekend. Perhaps, hopefully, the numbers converging upon Washington will be fewer than has been anticipated. In any event, it is a time for cool heads, not hot heads. But it is also a time for order, and it is the responsibility of government at all levels to secure and to preserve that order, and to deal firmly, swiftly, and adequately with any and all persons who may attempt to disrupt the normal operations of the Capital City and its environs.

Once again I refer to the Washington Post editorial of this morning which states:

The world will observe what happens in Washington tomorrow and will judge America accordingly. Feelings run very high about the war in Vietnam. But emotional tension cannot justify lawlessness or violence. The right of peaceable assembly is a right to appeal to the reason and conscience of the country. It is not a right to induce anarchy.

The duty of the local, state and Federal law-enforcement authorities in this situation is quite clear. They have a responsibility to let the march and the subsequent planned demonstration run their course—so long as they remain orderly and confine themselves to the routes and locations assigned to them; and they have a corollary responsibility to protect the marchers from any violent interference or disruption by citizens who disagree with them. But it is equally clear, of course, that the law-enforcement authorities have a responsibility to protect the public safety and to prevent any disruption of governmental activity.



There are those who say that we cannot afford to enforce our laws for fear of becoming a police state. I say that we have already moved much too far in the direction of a state of "anything goes"—a permissiveness and disrespect for order which can even more quickly destroy us. Citizens lose respect for a government, and for a nation, that does not have enough "guts" to enforce its laws, that lacks the will to brand as traitors those who betray it.

It is ironic, indeed, that the site the demonstrators have chosen for their anti-war spectacle is the hallowed ground on which stand the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial, the shrines that the Nation has erected to two of its most illustrious leaders—Presidents who led us in other wars. The presence of draft card burners and those who preach anarchy, and treason in such surroundings desecrates and defiles our American heritage.

Mr. President, it is the heroes—not the beatniks or the hippies—who have made this Nation great. And it is the heroes, not the hippies, who will keep it great as they preserve freedom in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point the editorial from today's Washington Post to which I have alluded; an article from today's Washington Post entitled "5,000 GI's To Help Control Rally Here"; an article from the Washington Post entitled "Leaders Divided on Aims of March"; an editorial from the Wheeling, W. Va., News Register of October 18, 1967, entitled "The Protesters and the Law"; and an article from the Reader's Digest of November, entitled "What Is at Stake in Vietnam: An Asian View."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register, Oct. 18, 1967]

#### THE PROTESTERS AND THE LAW

Although we are opposed to U.S. involvement in Vietnam we would not think of condoning the civil disobedience and disorder accompanying the current mass demonstrations against the Vietnam war.

Burning draft cards and blockading induction centers are violations of the law and must be dealt with as such. Our existence as a free people is dependent upon a healthy respect for law and order. Whether they be civil rights demonstrators or anti-war protesters, once the law has been broken the guilty parties should be arrested and prosecuted to the limits of the statutes.

Where law ends, tyranny begins.

[From the Reader's Digest, November 1967]  
WHAT IS AT STAKE IN VIETNAM: AN ASIAN VIEW

(An interview of Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin, Malaysian Ambassador to the United States, by Carl T. Rowan)

(NOTE.—Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin was a top political leader in Malaya when it was still a British protectorate and a member of the mission to London that won Malaysian independence in 1957. Still a member of the Cabinet in Malaysia, he has also served as his nation's ambassador to the United States since 1962.)

(Carl T. Rowan, director of the U.S. Information Agency 1964-65, is today a widely syndicated columnist, also a radio and TV commentator.)

Question. Mr. Ambassador, the United States has almost 500,000 troops in Vietnam. We have suffered 13,000 killed and 80,000 wounded there. Is Vietnam becoming too much an American war?

Answer. No. The South Vietnamese have over 700,000 troops and have suffered more than 70,000 military and civilian dead since 1961. Many nations are aiding them. South Korea has sent some 45,000 troops. The Philippines, Australia, New Zealand and Thailand have all contributed troops. Other countries have supplied specialized training and material support. All of us in Asia have a lot at stake there.

Question. Critics hold that, except for the Korean troops, Asian contributions have been of a token nature—that we are fighting for a group of nations that won't fight for themselves. Why, for example, hasn't your country sent troops?

Answer. Because of our own serious problem of communist subversion. Though we won the 12-year war against them seven years ago, some 1500 armed, fanatical, hardcore communists still lurk along our northern border with Thailand and in the jungles of Sarawak. These terrorists, many of them trained in Indonesia during Sukarno's "Crush Malaysia" campaign, now get their orders from Communist China. Our small armed force is barely sufficient for our own defense.

Question. Malaysia, then, can provide only moral support?

Answer. We have given considerably more than moral support. As early as 1958, our prime minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, saw that the communists would try to take South Vietnam through terrorism just as they were trying to take Malaysia, and he called upon the free world to help South Vietnam. Though hardpressed ourselves, we began to train South Vietnamese in counter-insurgency techniques we had found successful. Several thousand officers have now completed this continuing program. And when we won our victory over the communists, in 1960, we gave most of our military equipment to South Vietnam.

Question. You won your war against the communists yourselves. Why can't the South Vietnamese?

Answer. There has been a far more massive infiltration of communist men and material into South Vietnam than there was in Malaysia. The South Vietnamese need more help.

Question. You believe that U.S. involvement is vital, then?

Answer. You recall the political manifesto which Lin Biao, the Communist Chinese Vice Premier and Minister of National Defense, expounded in 1965—that Asia, Africa and Latin America are the rural areas of the world, and that if you take the rural areas the cities eventually will fall. U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam under present circumstances would put Communist China well on the way to achieving Phase 1 of Lin Biao's master plan: domination of Asia. We in Malaysia, for example, would be in deep trouble. Not only would the armed bands of communists be encouraged, but the underground subversives would re-emerge.

Let's face it. Your country carries a terrible burden today because no other country in the world has the will and the power to stop Red China's expansionist march. Your stand has achieved more than most Americans seem to realize. You have given confidence and hope to millions of Asians who would otherwise have submitted to the communist juggernaut. In Indonesia, which Sukarno had all but delivered to Peking, the army and the people rose up and crushed the communist coup attempt of 1965, later ousting Sukarno. I doubt they would have moved so confidently if your strong stand in Vietnam had not made it clear that you are not going to abandon Asia to communist tyranny.

Beyond this, Asians have been inspired toward economic and social cooperation as never before. They have formed the Asian Development Bank, created ASPAC (Asian and Pacific Council), reactivated the Association of Southeast Asia. All this has been made possible by the stabilizing presence—the security shield—the U.S. military.

Question. Some Americans say that we have no vital interests so far from home, that we have no right to be there.

Answer. The United States has every right to be there, helping South Vietnam to repel aggression and meet the needs of her people. You also have a "selfish" interest. Red China has openly and brazenly declared her aggressive intentions. If you don't make a stand in Vietnam, you risk a much bigger war in years to come.

No fair-minded Asian believes that the United States has any ulterior economic or territorial motives. We are aware that, instead of keeping territories that you occupied in World War II, you returned them and spent vast amounts of money to rebuild them. You helped Japan to become one of the most prosperous countries of the world. You sent your young men to save Korea from communist domination. You willingly gave independence to the Philippines. This is a record that no amount of propaganda can distort.

Question. But some eminent critics say that in Vietnam the United States is opposing nationalism, not communism—that we are warring against the same kind of revolution that gained us our independence.

Answer. I know that it wasn't "nationalism" that caused communist terrorists to kill Malaysians for 12 years. It was an international communist conspiracy. A fanatical wing of these same conspirators is operating in Vietnam today.

Question. Critics have said that the United States will be hated in Asia for generations because it has sent soldiers to kill young Asians. What are the racial implications of this war?

Answer. In my country, the communist terrorists were mainly of Chinese origin—but so were 90 percent of the innocent and helpless Malaysians they assassinated. It was no race war; it was a conflict between murderers and a people who wished only to live in peace. Likewise in Vietnam. Asians recognize that this is just another of the many struggles of freedom against tyranny and coercion. Asian nations have themselves sent troops to Vietnam, remember. Race is not a factor.

Question. Some critics say that the Saigon government is a dictatorship, unworthy of support under a pretense of defending freedom and democracy.

Answer. You cannot ignore the fact that, for years, South Vietnam has been under vicious attack. What the South Vietnamese have is a war government. Even in a democratic country, the government necessarily takes on extra power during periods of national emergency. Some of your President's powers during World War II might be considered "dictatorial" when viewed from peacetime. South Vietnam must move toward democracy, but first it must have a period of peace—of freedom from aggression.

One more point about this: Don't forget that the Hanoi regime in North Vietnam is a dictatorship beyond any doubt. It is easy to criticize the harassed leaders in Saigon, but does any critic maintain that the group in Hanoi is preferable?

Question. Do you think a negotiated settlement in Vietnam is possible?

Answer. We should be very wary about any such proposal. The communists will come to the conference table only when they think that by doing so they can still take over South Vietnam. We have seen the work of the communists who went to Geneva to negotiate. Before the ink was dry



on the agreement they signed in 1962, they started a campaign to subvert and take over the government of Laos from the neutralist premier Souvanna Phouma—one of the things they had pledged not to do.

In my country, when we had thoroughly whipped the communists both militarily and politically, there were no negotiations. Our government simply declared an end to "the emergency." It could well be that, if the American people show determination to last out the struggle in Vietnam, there will be a quiet, unannounced de-escalation, and eventually the war will fizzle out—but only after the communists are convinced that they have no hope of gaining their objectives.

Question. Mr. Ambassador, many Americans and some Asians fear that Communist China will enter the war and involve all Asia in a brutal conflict. Do you share this fear?

Answer. Before the United States bombed North Vietnam in 1965, the fear was widely expressed that such action would bring on Red Chinese intervention. But this has not happened. The Red Chinese leaders have been quite cautious.

Question. To sum up, just what is at stake in Vietnam?

Answer. The independence of more than 200 million people in Southeast Asia; the rice bowl of the world; vast supplies of rubber, tin and oil; strategic control of critical sea lanes; the possibility of a wider war; and the integrity of a great nation, the United States—all are at stake. And much more—not the least of which is the simple desire of small, weak countries like mine to live free of harassment and aggression by the great powers, free of foreign coercion and subversion. That is what is at stake.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

#### FIVE THOUSAND GI'S TO HELP CONTROL RALLY

Up to 5,000 Army troops are being flown into Washington to help control the anti-war demonstration scheduled here Saturday.

The first paratroopers, bearing troopers of the 82d Airborne Division and Army military police, arrived at Andrews Air Force Base yesterday afternoon. The paratroopers were flown from Ft. Bragg, N.C.

The military police detachment consisted of about 300 members of the 518th Military Police Detachment at Ft. Hood, Tex. The Pentagon clamped a tight lid on information about the paratroopers and military police, but it was learned the Army and the Air Force are prepared to airlift more than 6,000 troops, if it is believed necessary.

A massive security plan has been drawn up, with the possibility of 40,000 to 100,000 demonstrators, as predicted by the sponsors, and a fragmented leadership. Apparently there is no direct, overall control by any single group.

Government officials reportedly fear the lack of direction could lead to incidents requiring extensive police supervision.

Possibly 10,000 men will be involved in the police and patrol operation in the District and at the Pentagon. These would include the paratroopers, military policemen, 1500 Metropolitan Police, 2500 D.C. National Guardsmen, U.S. marshals, Government security guards and Park, White House and Capitol Police.

The job of the paratroopers will be to keep order at the Pentagon rally. They are to make no arrests. Federal marshals from the Justice Department will be on hand outside the Pentagon if arrests are needed. A special booth is being set up for that purpose.

Yesterday the General Services Administration issued a permit for the rally.

The permit allows a march across the Potomac River, after the rally at the Lincoln Memorial, and two separate demonstrations outside the Pentagon.

The permit has been in negotiation for two weeks.

The issuance of the permit does not settle the question of which route the marchers will take across the River. The permit refers only to "the most direct route."

Under the permit, the marchers must cross by Memorial Bridge. What is still in doubt is what route they will then take to the Pentagon.

Harry Van Cleve, general counsel of GSA, said yesterday that the permit would be revoked if law violations occurred "resulting in substantial danger to the people or property or in serious disorder."

"Mobilization (the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam) has represented to me that while there may be those who wish to break the law, that number will not be great," Van Cleve said.

March leader David Dellinger said there would be acts of "civil disobedience" at the Pentagon. He said he would specify at a news conference today what those acts would be.

The terms of the permit rule out an attempt by a self-styled group of hippies to link arms and form a circle around the Pentagon in an effort to "exorcise the evil spirits of the Pentagon."

Metropolitan Police Chief John B. Layton has released a detailed, 17-page memo on police activity, spelling out the deployment of 1503 policemen and 1847 National Guardsmen. (600 Guardsmen will be held in reserve for use in "critical areas," when needed. This reserve force is augmented by the city's 222-man Civil Disturbance Unit and Canine Corps.)

About 200 reserves of the Metropolitan Police Department were sworn in last night to serve from 12:01 a.m. Saturday until 8 a.m. Sunday. The men, to be assigned to precincts, will be unarmed.

Special details of police—at the railroad station, the bus terminals and other spots—will handle a wide assortment of problems.

Routine policing of the city will be carried on as usual. This is made possible through the cancellation of days off, changes in shifts and use of the Guardsmen for the demonstration areas in the District.

Layton made a strong pitch for courtesy and patience on the part of the police. "Members of the force, in handling the many unusual circumstances, shall be patient, discreet and courteous . . . during the demonstration," he ordered.

He ordered further that "arrests for minor infractions shall be held to a minimum."

He concluded: "This is one of the most important occasions that the Metropolitan Police Department has ever faced. It is imperative that every man and every official do his utmost to see that these orders are carried out, to the end that, when the demonstrations are over and the participants have dispersed, they may look back on this day with pleasure and that there will linger in their hearts a genuine esteem for our Department."

The Police-Community Relations Unit, headed by Insp. Vernon H. Culpepper, will be in full operation, reporting directly to Chief Layton.

National Guardsmen will not be on duty at the Pentagon, since that is outside the D.C. National Guard's jurisdiction. A two-day drill was scheduled by the Guard so its men would be available for the weekend.

Most of the troops were billeted at Ft. Myer, Va.

It is unlikely the Army troops would carry anything so menacing as fixed bayonets for the demonstrations.

Police plans, too, call for no rifles or bayonets, but only regular equipment. Police will wear plastic helmets with plexiglass fronts. They will also carry chemical spray.

About 200 marshals will be brought into

the area to augment the staff of 100 marshals under the U.S. Marshals here.

Six U.S. District Court judges and their staffs will be in the courthouse Saturday, ready to conduct a working court. The U.S. Commissioner also will be present. The District Court judges will work only if there is an overflow from the Court of General Sessions, which will have first crack at all demonstrators arrested. The U.S. Attorney's office will have from 30 to 40 assistant U.S. attorneys on hand to prosecute cases. A group of lawyers have volunteered their services to act as defense counsel for demonstrators arrested.

The day of demonstration will get under way at 11:30 a.m. with speeches and music at the Lincoln Memorial. The march across the Potomac begins at 1:30 p.m.

Demonstrators at the Pentagon will be limited, under the permit, to two areas. One demonstration will begin at 3 p.m. in the North parking lot, a ten-minute walk from the building.

Van Cleve of GSA said "a very large number" of demonstrators, but not all, will be allowed to assemble on a triangular grassy area in front of the Mall entrance at 4 p.m.

This demonstration, Van Cleve said, will consist of "picketing and vigiling." According to Mobilization leaders, it will also include civil disobedience, such as attempts to block the entrance of the Pentagon.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

#### LEADERS DIVIDED ON AIMS OF MARCH

The anti-war march on the Pentagon on Saturday will be on open-ended, come-one-come-all affair that will draw participants from a wide spectrum of American society.

It will include suburban housewives and radicals of the New Left; students and Trotskyites; black nationalists and hippies.

The diversity is intentional because sponsors want the biggest turnout possible. But it is also the source of a long conflict that has plagued the march from its inception here last spring.

It has become a divisive issue within the American peace movement and specifically within the sponsoring National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Radicals wanted an exercise in mass civil disobedience and virtual occupation of the Pentagon. Others wanted only a massive show of discontent—a symbolic "confrontation with the warmakers," not an invasion that might produce violent retaliation.

"It always works out the same way—the only thing we agree on is that we are against the war," observed a New York staff member of the Mobilization. "The rest of the time we're at each other's throats. It's like a scenario."

Mobilization's leadership—those who somehow gave it direction—reflect the diversity. They are professors who organized the first anti-war teach-ins; union leaders of moderate persuasion; civil rights veterans of the Southern protests; long-time pacifists.

Among them, these are most prominent:

David Dellinger, chairman and leading organizer of the National Mobilization Committee; editor of *Liberation*, an antiwar magazine; once imprisoned for three years for refusing to register for the draft; he has made two trips to North Vietnam to talk with leadership of that country and the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front.

Professor Robert Greenblatt, national coordinator of the Mobilization; professor at Cornell University; a native of Hungary, he was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp; an early founder of the campus anti-war "teach-ins" and a vice president of their sponsoring organization, the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy.

John Wilson, a national leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Commit-



tee; major spokesman for Negroes participating in the march; recently met, along with other Americans, with representatives of North Vietnam and the NLF in Czechoslovakia.

Sidney M. Peck, cochairman of Mobilization; associate professor of sociology at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland; author of a book on the American labor movement; veteran of the "teach-ins," currently chairman of the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council.

Jerry Rubin, project co-director for the march; nationally known for his leadership in antiwar campaigns in Berkeley, Calif.; led protests designed to block troop trains; appeared for House Committee on Un-American Activities hearing in an American Revolutionary War uniform; leader in Progressive Labor Party, a Peking-oriented faction of the Communist movement.

The Rev. James Bevel, a militant aide to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.; veteran of many civil rights drives in the South during the early 1960s; one of the most important organizers of first Mobilization march last April in New York; helped organize Saturday's march, but is said not to be participating because of illness.

Omar Tasha Abu Ahmed, a Black nationalist and leader of New York's East River Congress of Racial Equality; veteran of the early civil rights movement and an organizer of the 1963 civil rights march on Washington; a former lieutenant of Malcolm X in the Organization of Afro-American Unity; vice chairman of the recent Black Power Conference in Newark, and a leader of the "Black People's" contingent at the National Conference of New Politics in Chicago.

Dagmar Wilson, a cochairman of the Mobilization and founder of Women Strike for Peace.

Among the more prominent names now associated with the march are the Rev. William Sloane Coffin, Jr., chaplain at Yale University; Dr. Benjamin Spock, eminent child physician and until three weeks ago the national cochairman of Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE); and the American poet, Robert Lowell.

The march has received legal assistance from two prominent civil rights lawyers, William Kunstler and Arthur Kinoy. The Washington Lawyers' Committee, which will aid any demonstrators jailed, is headed by Edward DeGrazia.

From time to time, according to members of the Mobilization's large administrative committee, the list of active organizers has included Chicago labor leader Sidney Lens; Fred Halstead, head of the Socialists Workers Party in New York, and Ralph D'Gia of the War Resisters' League, a pacifist organization.

The Pentagon march was planned as a follow-up to the large Mobilization march in New York last April. Its genesis was a meeting in Washington's Hawthorne School, 501 G St. S.W., on May 20 and 21. There were veterans of the New York march, headed by its chief organizer, Mr. Bevel, and representatives of many peace groups, SNCC, Students for a Democratic Society, Socialist splinter parties, and a couple of Communists.

The march plans lagged during the summer months and many feared it would flop. By late summer, Rubin had been chosen to revive it with the detailed organization work in Washington, and he arrived with his Berkeley-style radicalism and flair intact.

"We are now in the business of wholesale and widespread resistance and dislocation of American society," he told the press. Mobilization's national chairman Dellinger was on record as predicting the marchers would "shut down the Pentagon" and leave no Government building "untacked."

Such radicalism, echoed by some on Mobilization in New York, promptly dismayed many moderates from well-established peace groups. A symbolic showdown occurred over

an issue of The Mobilizer, the committee's publication.

Edited by one of the Berkeley group, it spoke of America's "murderous military machine" and promised that during the march: "We will fill hallways and block the entrances (of the Pentagon). Thousands of people will disrupt the center of the American war machine. In the name of humanity we will call the warmakers to task."

An ad hoc committee of Mobilization leaders attending the New Left conference in Chicago became alarmed. Such groups as Veterans For Peace, SANE, and Trade Unionists For Peace feared the radical overtones would keep them from participating.

That issue of The Mobilizer was scrapped, editors were changed, and the paper reappeared with a less militant explanation of the march from Peck, the Cleveland professor.

For example, Peck emphasized that any civil disobedience at the Pentagon was up to the individual marcher. It "is planned only for those who are prepared to risk arrest, if that is necessary, to disrupt the war machine," he said. No one knows how much civil disobedience—bursting into the Pentagon—there will be, but one march leader estimated that 2,000 to 10,000 would try it.

The march's official tone—if anything about it can be called "official"—now stresses the symbolic confrontation. The leaders argue that the march will lend "national visibility" to the antiwar protests, in contrast to the sporadic and isolated instances of draft-card surrenders and door-to-door political canvassing.

Besides moderating its tone, Mobilization also brought into its top-level organization John Wilson, the slender SNCC staffer now running its New York office. He was named codirector of the project, it is said, to give Negroes equal representation in line with black-power demands at the Chicago New Left conference.

Whether and how Negroes will participate are unanswered questions. The Mobilization staff expects the Negro contingent to join the rally at the Lincoln Memorial, then break off for separate meetings in Negro neighborhoods of Washington.

The Washington Committee for Black Power refused to participate on any grounds, declaring: "The day is over when black people jump up and march like puppets when their white puppetmasters pull the strings."

Codirector Wilson retorted: "I'm far from being a puppet. The march is particularly relevant to black people, but I wouldn't get into a hassle with anyone who doesn't want to attend."

A major mystery of the march has been the absence of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, whose presence at the April demonstration in New York gave the peace movement a substantial lift.

Dr. King has said he regrets being unable to participate in the march. He has a fundraising benefit scheduled in Cleveland. His spokesmen have denied persistent rumors that Dr. King is staying away because of the possibility of large-scale disobedience.

Dr. King's aide, Mr. Bevel, also is not active in the march preparations now, although he was the chief organizer of the April demonstration. His friends said he is ill in Chicago. Another close associate of Dr. King, the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, is a Mobilization cochairman, but he has not actively assisted in the march preparations.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

#### AN APPEAL TO REASON

The Americans who plan to march tomorrow from the Lincoln Memorial to the Pentagon in protest against the war in Vietnam have an indubitable right to do so. This form of expressing dissent from a policy of their own Government is honored by tradition and

protected by the Constitution. It bears witness to a freedom which is at once a source of strength to America and an essential element of American life. When all this has been said, however, it is vital for the marchers to remember that the constitutional right which they exercise is a right to assemble peaceably and that it must be exercised in good order and in conformity with valid laws.

Leaders of the March have conferred with Government representatives, and reasonable rules have been formulated as to routes, permits and appropriate places for demonstration. The Government has manifested, as it should, a genuine tolerance for, if not hospitality to, a demonstration against itself; and the General Counsel of the General Services Administration, Mr. Harry R. Van Cleave Jr., has accorded full recognition to the civil liberties issues involved.

Not all of the March leaders have responded in kind. These leaders are diverse in background, interest and aim. Their organization appears unstructured. And while some have been genuinely concerned to keep the protest peaceable, others have talked quite irresponsibly about civil disobedience and even violence. There may be a few, indeed, who seek disorder for its own sake—or for the sake of concealed interests not primarily concerned with peace and justice.

There are confused appeals to the marchers, some of them couched in the language of incitement. One publication of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam declares, for example: "Direct action is planned for those who are prepared to close down the Pentagon war machine . . . The general plan is for persons to enter the Pentagon and to block the staircases, hallways, and doorways by the traditional non-violent sit-in techniques; in doing this we will disrupt the war machine's normal functioning."

The duty of the local, state and Federal law-enforcement authorities in this situation is quite clear. They have a responsibility to let the march and the subsequent planned demonstration run their course—so long as they remain orderly and confine themselves to the routes and locations assigned to them; and they have a corollary responsibility to protect the marchers from any violent interference or disruption by citizens who disagree with them. But it is equally clear, of course, that the law-enforcement authorities have a responsibility to protect the public safety and to prevent any disruption of governmental activity.

It is a puerile form of anarchy to talk about closing down the Pentagon. These marchers had better acquaint themselves with the facts of life: they are not going to be allowed to close down the Pentagon "war machine" or any other kind of United States Government machine.

The police ought to use as much force as may be necessary—as much and no more—to maintain order and prevent law-breaking. Persons who interfere with the normal functioning of government or otherwise break the law should be arrested and taken as promptly as possible to a court; there will be a number of judges on hand to deal with them according to law. No resort to clubs and disabling gases can be justified save by absolute necessity to stop mob action. The essential task of the police in this difficult situation will be to contain violence, not to punish it or to become engulfed in it.

The world will observe what happens in Washington tomorrow and will judge America accordingly. Feelings run very high about the war in Vietnam. But emotional tension cannot justify lawlessness or violence. The right of peaceable assembly is a right to appeal to the reason and conscience of the country. It is not a right to induce anarchy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?



Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the statement of the Senator from West Virginia with respect to the proposed demonstration tomorrow.

In this connection, it is proper to recall that the first amendment to the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

It is obvious that there is no better place in the United States to petition the Government than at the seat of the government.

The courts have protected the constitutional rights of free speech, petition, and assembly which have been interpreted to comprehend demonstrations. The States and their instrumentalities—such as a municipality—and the Federal Government have authority, through their police powers—and when I say "police power," I refer to their general police powers rather than to the police as an agency—to regulate demonstrations as to number of participants, time, and place. But regulations cannot be so used as to prevent the exercise of constitutional rights. I have received letters recently about certain individuals of whom we have heard much lately concerning the statements they make about our Government, advocating its overthrow, advocating insurrection, advocating riots.

But again, the Supreme Court—and it is not just the present members for the Supreme Court continues—the Court has held that speech, reprehensible as it may be, cannot be punished unless it is such that is reasonably calculated to bring about presently the act which is advocated. It is difficult to define, but that is generally the constitutional situation.

But I affirm strongly, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has correctly said, that the first amendment is not a license for the violation of law. It is not a license for the obstruction of the processes of government. It is not a license for anarchy.

I do not know what is intended or what will happen tomorrow, but I hope very much that the law will be obeyed and, if not, that it will be enforced. The protections of the first amendment are far reaching, even to protect the advocacy of the overthrow of the very government which protects the one who speaks. But there is no right to violate the law and to obstruct with force the processes of the Government of the United States.

The very essence of our Government is that it is based upon law and respect for the processes of the law. It is based upon the consent of the people. But that consent is to be determined through the processes of the Government itself, by the choice of the people in the selection of their officials through the influence the people bring to bear upon legislation and policy in many ways, including free speech, but not through violation of law.

For a second element in our system is the enforcement of the law.

As the Senator from West Virginia has said, there are Members of this body who have not agreed with every aspect of policy in Vietnam, as I have not, as I have said in speeches for over 2 years, and I shall continue to do so. But I know of none—and I include myself among them—who has suggested that he would not support our Government once its decision was made, or who would advocate disobedience to law.

In every war there have been those who have objected to military service for conscientious reasons, and they have been protected. Others have been deferred and passed over for compassionate reasons. I do not suppose that anyone, no matter how brave he may be, looks forward to engagement in war. But thousands have served in every war, as a duty to their country, under that obligation and substantive truth of our governmental system that it is a system based upon law.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his helpful remarks.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], at my suggestion, offered an amendment that would force the Subversive Activities Control Board either to go to work or get out of business. The amendment which I proposed to the majority leader on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, which he drafted and introduced, provides a good resolution to the SACB problem.

My opposition to the Dirksen proposal as to the continued appropriation of funds for the SACB was based on the fact that for 20 months it has been an idle, do-nothing Board that has been wasting the taxpayers' money at a rate of \$300,000 per year.

I frankly wished to abolish the Board and to transfer its functions, such as they were, to the Department of Justice. The Mansfield-Proxmire amendment will achieve this unless the Board, at long last, goes to work.

I vigorously opposed the Dirksen proposal because it would not provide the Board with anything to do. It continued to rely on the Attorney General to initiate action, and the Attorney General seemed most unlikely to take any action.

The Dirksen bill did not meet certain clear constitutional objections. Of course, Senator DIRKSEN disagrees. He contends that the Attorney General would act under his amendment and the Board would make a contribution to the struggle against domestic communism.

The Mansfield-Proxmire amendment resolves this difference. If the Attorney General does not initiate action before the Board in the next year, the Board is abolished.

If the Attorney General does initiate action and the Board is put to work, the

\$26,000 per year Commissioners will be performing at least some function. The taxpayer will at least be getting something for his money.

My position throughout debate on the bill has been that the Attorney General will not use the Dirksen proposal because of constitutional defects. Consequently, it is my belief that the Mansfield-Proxmire amendment will result in the death of the Board. At the heart of this whole issue is personal freedom in America and the sacred safeguards to the individual of the Bill of Rights. In my view, the death of this Board will contribute to freedom in America.

But in either event, the taxpayer will win. The Mansfield-Proxmire amendment will provide that either the Board is abolished and the \$300,000 per year is saved, or the Board is put to work to earn the \$300,000 per year the taxpayer is spending on it.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished minority leader supports this amendment, too, and, as a matter of fact, will cosponsor the amendment, which would make it pretty unanimous. I am delighted at that. I think this is completely consistent with the position he has taken and completely consistent with his sincere belief that his proposal would result in an active Board.

It seems to me that this is a good resolution of the matter, and I most heartily welcome it.

#### CONFUSION, NOT ECONOMY, RESULTS FROM HAPHAZARD BUDGET CUTTING

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the absence of a budgeting priority system continues to create a shambles within the Government. Everyone wants economy in Government, but the methods now being pursued can only lead to disastrous conditions and overall higher costs.

In this morning's Washington Post, Federal Diary columnist, Mike Causey, reports on the confusion running rampant throughout Washington after the House adopted its meat-ax budget-cutting approach. As Causey says:

If any Federal Agency has figured out the actual impact of the House's \$5 billion-plus spending cut, the House Appropriations Committee would appreciate a call. More than 200 House members voted for the economy plan but nobody seems to know what it would do.

Mr. President, that "nobody seems to know what it would do" is not surprising to me; as long as Congress cannot relate the merits of one program as compared to those of other proposals, there just is no rational way to implement budget cuts. Unsophisticated across-the-board reductions are dangerous as well as being chaotic; the successful program is sliced as much as the marginal program, but the needs which make programs vital do not diminish, and, in the end, Congress spends more to bring these important programs back into effective operation.

Once again I emphasize that the alternative exists to this terrible helter-skelter budgeting approach. The alternative is a logical system of budget decisionmaking, a system which clearly points out advantages and costs of pro-



posed spending plans. Last month the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee held hearings on one set of these new systems, the planning-programing-budgeting—PPB—techniques.

One powerful conclusion came out of those hearings: Government discount rate policies now cause serious economic dislocations. The Government has been employing very low interest rates in cost-benefit studies, and this has meant that many vastly expensive projects with minimal, and even negative, returns are justified. According to witnesses in the PPB hearings, the Government should apply alternative discount rates which better reflect opportunity costs of Government investment.

As a matter of fact, they testified that the entire economic profession, all economists who work in that area, unanimously support that position.

If Congress wants to avoid future turmoil, budgeting systems must be adopted which show such alternative uses of funds. That is the realistic path to true economy in government.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Effect of Spending Cut Is Unclear to Everyone," from the October 20, 1967, Washington Post be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EFFECT OF SPENDING CUT IS UNCLEAR TO EVERYONE

(By Mike Causey)

If any Federal agency has figured out the actual impact of the House's \$5-billion-plus spending cut, the House Appropriations Committee would appreciate a call. More than 200 House members voted for the economy plan but nobody seems to know what it would do.

Down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, Federal agencies are equally in the dark. Many of them haven't had this year's budgets approved and they've already been directed to cut back on them.

Here's a sample of non-opinions gathered yesterday from a wide variety of sources:

An Appropriations Committee member: "I don't have the foggiest notion what we did. The action taken (Wednesday night) created a completely different animal from the cut we had planned."

An agency official whose budget (he thinks) has been seriously hurt by the House: "If we didn't have any people on the payroll, not a single employee, we still couldn't completely comply with this resolution. Many of our spending obligations were incurred a year or two ago."

An agency official whose budget (he thinks) is untouched by the economy edict: "I think we are okay. We did most of our hiring early in the year and have people ready to replace those who leave, with the result that we really don't have vacancies. We will have to be selective in our future hiring of clerical employees, but I think we are safe from any personnel cuts."

Budget Director Charles L. Schultze: He told the Senate Appropriations Committee yesterday that if the House action stands some agencies would have to cut their personnel by 10 to 20 per cent. Schultze said the resulting severance payments would require agencies to make even greater economy savings to pay the people they laid off.

Finally, from a Capitol Hill expert who has been watching appropriations battles and Federal agencies for 30 years: "A hell of a lot of people are going to be hurt before this thing is over."

Put them all together and you will find that nobody really knows what is going on. The only sure thing is that many agencies would be forced to lay off at least some workers and that promotions would be harder to get.

Sidelights: The House exempted the Internal Revenue Service, the Customs Bureau, the FBI, Post Office and Defense agencies dealing with the Vietnam war from the economy drive. But two agencies—the General Services Administration and the Coast Guard—with substantial Vietnam programs were not included in the exemption. They would have to come up with a combined total of \$22 million in savings.

Midnight Magic: As if they didn't have enough worries, departments such as Labor, Agriculture, Health, Education and Welfare and a score of smaller agencies will soon be broke again.

The continuing resolution permits agencies whose budgets haven't been approved to carry on operations. It expires at midnight Monday. The Senate is expected to agree to an extension—the second or third such this year—to let the Government operate until budgets are approved.

If the continuing resolution should not be approved for some reason, those agencies would be technically broke. They could meet the next employee payroll because they would be paying for work performed two weeks ago. But after that . . .

#### CAPACITY UTILIZATION DROPS SHARPLY IN THIRD QUARTER

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve Board has just reported a significant drop in manufacturing capacity utilization for the third quarter of 1968. This means that, obviously, the country does not need a slowdown because there is a slowdown. During the July-September period, plants on the average used only 83.8 percent of their capacity. This figure was down from 84.8 percent in the second quarter and from 87 percent in the first quarter of the year. Although strikes in the automobile, copper, rubber, and steel-hauling industries were all in process at some time during the quarter, the Federal Reserve Board stated that they had accounted for no more than one-half of the decline in the index.

Mr. President, capacity utilization does not decline in an overheated economy or at a time when demand is advancing rapidly. The fact is that productive capacity has grown tremendously in this country over the past few years. I have continually argued that there is sufficient economic capacity to support a much more rapid economic expansion than anything in prospect today.

This news of the second quarterly decline in a row in capacity utilization—and it is really the third—is especially meaningful, coming as it does on the heels of other bearish economic news. Last week it was reported that unemployment rose in September from 3.8 percent to 4.1 percent of the labor force—the highest level since late 1965. Then on Monday the Federal Reserve Board announced that its index of industrial production fell from 157.8 percent of the 1957-59 average in August to 156.3 in September. The index is now below the level it had reached a year ago when it was 157.7.

Mr. President, it must be remembered that this is a growing country with the

work force increasing at a rate of 1.5 million a year and with our capacity to produce increasing greatly. Under these circumstances, when production goes down we are not suffering in demand.

These most recent economic indicators clearly support the view that the administration's call for a tax increase is premature.

It would be sheer folly to impose new taxes with the outlook so uncertain.

All they could do would be to contribute to the slowdown and sluggishness in the economy which is moving too slowly and not too rapidly.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times, entitled "Factory Use Fell in Third Quarter," be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTORY USE FELL IN THIRD QUARTER—SIGNIFICANT DROP FOR SECOND 3-MONTH PERIOD HURTS JOHNSON TAX CASE—STRIKES NOT MAIN CAUSE—FIGURE OF 83.8 PERCENT UTILIZATION OF CAPACITY IS A DIP FROM PREVIOUS 84.8 AND 87 PERCENT

WASHINGTON, October 18.—The portion of their total capacity that manufacturers had in actual use in the third quarter of this year dropped significantly for the second straight quarter, the Federal Reserve Board reported today.

The decline, which Reserve officials said was by no means entirely a result of strikes, weakens the Administration's case for a tax increase. That case has been based, in part, on the argument that the expanding economy would produce pressure on manufacturing capacity and thus threaten to create the classic type of inflation caused by an excess of demand over supply.

The third-quarter figure, which is still subject to revision, showed that manufacturing industry used, on the average, 83.8 per cent of its capacity in the July-September quarter. The second-quarter figure had been 84.8 per cent and the first-quarter figure 87.0 per cent.

#### PREFERRED RATE

The primary processing industries, whose capacity utilization rates tend to shift around more rapidly than those for all of manufacturing, fell to 82.1 per cent from 82.8 per cent in the second quarter and 85.9 per cent in the first.

Industry in general prefers to operate at about 91 or 92 per cent of capacity, the experts agree. Any higher rate tends to impair efficiency and increase costs.

Industrial capacity has been increasing in recent years as a result of a sharp rise in business capital spending.

In testimony on the proposed tax increase, Administration officials and economists who favored the tax increase, argued that capacity could—and presumably would—rise very quickly to inefficient and inflationary levels from the rate of about 85 per cent that existed in the second quarter. The second-quarter figures were the latest available at the time of the hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee on the tax bill in August.

The third-quarter capacity utilization rate of just under 84 per cent brought that rate back to the average level that prevailed over the 10 years beginning in 1956. Reserve officials pointed out this fact as a means of demonstrating that the third-quarter rate was not particularly low.

The 1956-66 period used for the long-term comparison was, however, a period that encompassed two recessions and a long period of subnormal business activity, dating roughly from 1961 through early 1964.

Strikes in the automobile, copper, rubber



and steel-hauling business all were in progress at some point in the third quarter. Reserve officials said, however, that they believed these strikes accounted for less than half of the third-quarter decline in capacity utilization.

They noted also, however, that the slowdown in business activity that occurred in the first half of this year had extended into July—the first month of the third quarter. Industrial production, which is the base on which capacity utilization is figured, actually hit its low point for the year in July.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TOMORROW'S ANTIWAR MARCH ON WASHINGTON A SHAMEFUL DISPLAY OF ANTI-AMERICANISM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, tomorrow, thousands upon thousands of demonstrators are expected to descend on Washington with the avowed purpose of disrupting the Pentagon.

I cannot help regarding these demonstrations as a shameful display of anti-Americanism. Certainly, they have the effect of giving aid and comfort to the enemy and prolonging the war in Vietnam, and were there a formal declaration of war, their conduct would be treasonous.

Perhaps some comfort can be found in the fact that these people do not speak for or represent the American people, and I hope the Hanoi regime and our Communist enemies realize this.

The Washington Evening Star, last night, published a very fine editorial about this demonstration. The editorial called for enforcement of the law and that the demonstrators be arrested, tried, and sent to jail if they are found guilty of violating the law in their so-called efforts to disrupt the Pentagon.

I think this is a splendid editorial which puts the matter in its proper perspective, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### TWO AMERICAN BOYS

What is wrong with America? What is right?

A photo layout on the front-page of the late editions of Tuesday's Star gives at least a partial answer.

One picture showed a weary young Marine taking cover in a trench at Con Thien while writing a letter, possibly the last letter he will ever write. The other was a photograph of a young man burning his draft card in Philadelphia, with the outlines of Independence Hall in the background.

One should try not to be bitter about such contrasting portraits of two American boys. Both, we suppose, can be credited with a certain sense of dedication. The Marine in all probability had volunteered to fight for his country, to fight where and when he was ordered to fight. The draft-card burner not only is unwilling to fight in this war; he hopes to persuade others to follow his example.

There is something wrong when hundreds of young Americans burn their draft cards in public while other young Americans responding to the draft have to struggle across the bodies of anti-war demonstrators to get to their buses, as was the case in Oakland, California, on Monday. But, within reason, there is also something right about this.

None of us should forget that the men who assembled in Independence Hall on July 4, 1776, to sign the Declaration of Independence, the men who mutually pledged to each other "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour," were rebels in their own right.

True enough, they were men of the stripe of the young Marine at Con Thien. Had it been otherwise the American Revolution would have died in its infancy. Still, those signers of the Declaration believed in the right of dissent, in the right of petition, in the right of peaceable assembly for the redress of grievances. But the emphasis, we think, must be on "peaceable."

Our own city now faces a threat of a march this Saturday by 40,000 to 100,000 protesters against the war in Vietnam. Leaders of the group say that the objective "is to force a confrontation and to disrupt the Pentagon."

We say that it will be a national disgrace if anything of the sort is tolerated. This is not the freedom that the signers had in mind in 1776. It is not the kind of freedom that our troops are fighting and dying for today in Vietnam.

If the draft-card burners and their related peaceniks really try to "disrupt the Pentagon" in an illegal demonstration they should be arrested, tried and sent to jail—and made to stay there for a while. In short, they should be treated as John Hancock and his colleagues would have treated any Tories who might have tried illegally to subvert the American Revolution.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMUNIST SUPPORT OF PENTAGON DEMONSTRATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have reliable information and reports that establish beyond doubt that key organizers and leaders of the march on the Pentagon tomorrow are members of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

These reports and information further establish that the march is heavily supported by the Hanoi government as an extension within the continental United States of the war in South Vietnam.

Well-known and active functionaries of the Communist Party were present at the meetings in which the march was planned. Very reliable information indicates the head of a pro-Chinese Communist group intends to participate in the march and break his group away from the main demonstration to go through the ghettos of Washington to recruit demonstrators and encourage protesters.

Some of the demonstration leaders have been in recent contact with representatives of the National Liberation Front—the Vietcong—and some of the

very key leaders have been to Hanoi more than once.

It is clear from the evidence that this is part of a move by the Communists, especially of the North Vietnamese Government, to divide the American people, disrupt our war effort, and to discredit our Government before the world.

The leaders of North Vietnam consider the march on the Pentagon tomorrow as much of their war effort as the guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam and the North Vietnamese Army assault on our troops on the battlefield.

Those who participate in the demonstrations tomorrow will be, in effect, cooperating with and assisting the enemy. Some will participate without knowledge of what they are doing, but the damage to the Nation will not be lessened because of their ignorance.

Every person who plans to participate should be aware that this is not just another protest. It is a valuable service to our enemy.

Knowingly or not, those who demonstrate here in these movements are discouraging our fighting men, and giving our enemy hope that after all, if they push us hard enough and bleed us long enough, that we will be persuaded to give in to them.

We are now at the dividing line. If the enemy should be able to create enough sentiment in this country for us to turn our backs on our commitments in South Vietnam, I have no doubt but that we will be inviting trouble all over the world.

This is a time for national solidarity, for unity, and dedication to our national purpose. The right to dissent to the policy of our Government is one thing; but to actively assist the enemy is wholly another thing.

The evidence is clear that the demonstration scheduled tomorrow is a tool of and a product of a Communist effort to defeat the United States in South Vietnam.

We must beware of this event—and all other events of like kind.

This one has the curse of communism on it, and is a direct arm of the enemy with which our men are engaged in mortal combat in the jungles of South Vietnam at this very hour and will be while the demonstration is going on.

The time has come to call a spade a spade.

The demonstration planned for this weekend in Washington is clearly and undeniably a Communist enterprise.

Its key organizers throughout the country have been the cadres of the Communist Party.

It is part of an orchestration of hate toward America which the Communists have scheduled in virtually every major nation in the world.

I am prepared to be specific on this; and, in addition to what I have said, I call special attention to the following items:

In France, Communist Humanité advertised demonstrations to take place October 19–22 in Paris and in 20 departments of France. It said:

Hundreds of thousands of Frenchmen will consider it an honor to participate in the Saturday marches. Under our coordinated blows, the aggression will finally be ex-

tinguished and freedom will flourish in the land of Vietnam.

The Saturday that is mentioned is tomorrow.

Second, in Italy, Communist papers reported that "thousands" tried to reach the U.S. Embassy in Rome in order to demonstrate; announced that anti-U.S. demonstrations would be held October 20-22 in 12 areas; and played up U.S. antiwar activities.

Notice that included in the dates mentioned is the day following today.

Third, in Finland, Communist Kansan Uutiset reported that 21 organizations would be represented at a demonstration on October 21 in support of demonstrators in the United States.

Again, the date mentioned is the day following today.

Fourth, in Belgium "sympathy" demonstrations have been announced in five cities for the period October 20-25. In Brussels, a rally to be held by the newly formed Vietnam Coordinating Committee on October 21 was to include a "debate" on the war.

The same date there as to the Saturday.

Fifth, in India, Bombay papers first reported that a march on the American Consulate-General would be held October 21 to coincide with the Washington march, and then carried a new date of October 19.

Sixth, in Brazil, nationalistic Correio da Manhã of Rio reported that the National Student Union was coordinating a nationwide Vietnam week October 16-21, and that students at Belo Horizonte would conduct a mock trial of President Johnson on October 19.

Seventh, in Chile, Communist Siglo announced that Uruguayan, Colombian, and Panamanian delegations would take part in a "continental youth solidarity meeting on Vietnam" in Santiago, October 26-29.

These are only a few examples of the most effective Communist propaganda operation since the "germ warfare" symphony during the Korean war.

The Vietcong have, of course, been given their role:

On October 16, Hanoi radio announced:

A South Vietnam Peoples Committee for Solidarity with the American People has been founded in South Vietnam. The committee's formation appears to be an outgrowth of the September 6 through 12 Bratislava Conference which brought together North Vietnam, Front, and American Peace Group representatives to "further develop the antiwar movement."

The new committee is headed by Ho Thu, Deputy Secretary General of the Front's Central Committee, and includes such well known NLF personalities as Madame Nguyen Thi Bia (who headed the Front delegation to Bratislava).

Hanoi radio quotes Ho Thu as saying that: "The struggle of the Vietnamese people for liberation and that of the American people against the Johnson government's policy of aggression and the struggle of the world people against U.S. imperialism to defend peace are closely linked together." Ho added that the committee was founded with the view to "consolidating and developing the close relation and the solidarity and friendship between the Vietnamese and American people, and promoting the coordinated struggle for the interests of the two peoples and for peace and security in the world."

The committee immediately sent messages

to two American groups, the National Mobilization Committee and the Students Mobilization Committee, supporting their October 16 through 21 peace drive.

In a related move the North Vietnamese Women's Union sent a message to American women "hailing their courageous and sustained struggle against Johnson's war of aggression in Vietnam." The letter also approved the October 21 drive.

Now all of us here know that most of the "peace mobilizers" are not Communists. The overwhelming majority are youngsters who have grievances against a society which has given them time and money enough to indulge the luxury of self-pity.

But the fact that they are not Communists is irrelevant—they are acting out a scenario written and staged by Moscow.

The Bill of Rights protects their freedom to be dupes of Moscow, provided, of course, they remain within the law.

At the same time, those of us for whom history did not begin with the war in Vietnam have the duty to tell them, and the American people, that what we are witnessing is not a great "spontaneous upsurge of dissent."

We are witnessing a classic demonstration of Communist "agit prop." A hard core of cadres has gone into operation, seized the theme of "peace," and created a front largely composed of innocents.

The same technique was used in the 1930's with the American League Against War and Fascism; in the 1940's with the Progressive Party; in the 1950's with the Stockholm Peace Movement.

That sincere Americans allow themselves to be manipulated in this cynical fashion by the Moscow puppeteers can be explained only by ignorance or by stupidity.

After the evidence I have introduced today the excuse of ignorance can hardly be further accepted.

Mr. President, these tragic happenings are just as plain as the noses on our faces—well documented and proved by unimpeachable sources. I had the word. Again I warn the American people, the people of this great, fine city and the people throughout our Nation, to be aware of movements of this kind, that originate in this way, that have a purpose directly contrary to our purposes here in America, and, in fact, not only contradictory but, as I have read, the long arm and an adjunct of the fighting war itself against our people and against our Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of morning business on Mon-

day, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] be recognized for a period of 45 minutes, and that following that time, until not later than 3:30 o'clock, the time be equally divided between the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader, or whomever they may designate, and that not later than 3:30, there be a quorum call, and then a vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, later reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, October 23, 1967, at not later than 3:30 p.m., there be a quorum call to be followed by a vote on amendment No. 415, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Ordered further, That all time for debate on the amendment following the speech by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, or their designees.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 23, 1967, at 12 noon.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 20, 1967:

##### U.S. NAVY

Vice Adm. John J. Hyland, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of admiral.

Rear Adm. William F. Bringle, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral.

Adm. Roy L. Johnson, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. Paul Masterton, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following-named officers when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. Charles E. Weakley, U.S. Navy.

##### IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Robert B. Aasen, to be first lieutenant, and ending Richard N. Zweig, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Sen-



ate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 4, 1967.

#### IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nomination beginning James E. Allen, to be lieutenant (jg.) in the Navy, and ending James A. Addison, to be captain in the Navy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 3, 1967.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

*They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.—Isaiah 40: 31.*

We are thankful, our Father, for Thy strength, available for us. Having reached a place of power with Thy help, keep us from the sin of complacency. Deliver us from indifference in the presence of evil, complacency in the presence of human suffering, and smug satisfaction with our own achievements. May we never be at ease so long, our Lord, as large areas of our national and social life are not in harmony with Thee. Stir us to constant struggle against evil and for righteousness.

Now may the strength of God pilot us, the power of God preserve us, the wisdom of God instruct us, the hand of God protect us, and the shield of God defend us. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 1948. An act for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran;
- H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Angelique Kousoulas;
- H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Yoo Young Hui and her daughter, Ok Young;
- H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso;
- H.R. 3430. An act for the relief of Yim Mel Lam;
- H.R. 3497. An act for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta;
- H.R. 4534. An act for the relief of Mary Bernadette Linehan; and
- H.R. 5216. An act for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2310. An act to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which

the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 107. An act for the relief of Cita Rita Leola Ines;
- S. 866. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Pacino Biancarosso;
- S. 872. An act for the relief of Francisco Renigio Fabre Solino (Frank R. S. Fabre);
- S. 878. An act to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property;
- S. 1129. An act for the relief of Demetra Lani Angelopoulos;
- S. 1180. An act for the relief of Ana Jacalne;
- S. 1327. An act for the relief of Dr. Samad Montazee;
- S. 2072. An act for the relief of Nestor S. Cueto;
- S. 2091. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Campuzano;
- S. 2120. An act for the relief of Jose D. Neugart;
- S. 2168. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Pina y Gil;
- S. 2175. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan Emilio Caignet y Crespo;
- S. 2191. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Suarez Diaz;
- S. 2193. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Jesus Gonzalez;
- S. 2248. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Fuentes Roca;
- S. 2256. An act for the relief of Dr. Margarita Lorigados;
- S. 2285. An act for the relief of Gordon Shih Gum Lee; and
- S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

### AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS FOR JOINT MEETING ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, TO RECEIVE PRESIDENT OF UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Friday, October 27, 1967, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the United Mexican States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take it this request is for the sole purpose of the joint meeting?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

### ABUSE OF HOSPITALITY BY ARAB STUDENTS

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a series of resolutions enacted by a group known as the Organization of Arab Students in the U.S.A. This organization is evidently composed of students from Arab nations who are pursuing their studies in the United States. They held a convention recently in Cambridge, Mass.

One of the products of this convention was a resolution about Vietnam. This resolution termed the hostilities in Vietnam as a "brutal, imperialistic war" and called for "the immediate stoppage of Arab oil supply to the American Military Establishment in Vietnam, Thailand, and Southeast Asia in general."

I think that it is impertinent for these Arab students to abuse the hospitality of the United States as they have done. It would have been more in order if they had urged the dictators of several Arab States to cease rattling their bent and tarnished sabres and to try to do something for the benefit of the ignorant poor people whom they now exploit.

### THE COPYRIGHT PROTECTION—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 26

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the other body passed Senate Joint Resolution 114 which would extend the duration of the copyright protection in certain cases. This was apparently made necessary by the failure of the other body to act on the copyright revision bill passed earlier this year by this body.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore announce that next Thursday, October 26, Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Judiciary Committee will have hearings on this matter. Those Members and other parties desiring to communicate their views on the subject may do so by contacting Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Judiciary Committee before that time.

### AUTHORITIES SHOULD MEET RESPONSIBILITY OF MAINTAINING LAW WITH FAIRNESS AND FIRMNESS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, with these demonstrations taking place here in Washington, I hope the same mistake made in Detroit will not be made here tomorrow. General Throckmorton, the overall commander in Detroit issued the order, "Unload your weapons and put